EURIPIDEA ALTERA

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

J.M. BREMER · L.F. JANSSEN · H. PINKSTER

H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM SEXAGESIMUM PRIMUM

DAVID KOVACS

EURIPIDEA ALTERA

EURIPIDEA ALTERA

BY

DAVID KOVACS

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kovacs, David.
Euripidea altera / by David Kovacs.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 161)
English and Greek.
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 9004106243 (alk. paper)
1. Euripides–Criticism and interpretation. 2. Greek drama (Tragedy)—History and criticism. 3. Mythology, Greek, in literature. I. Title. II. Series.
PA3978.K64 1996
882'.01—dc 20

96-22907
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. - Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.
Früher Schriftenreihe
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
161. Euripidea altera. - 1996
Euripidea altera / by David Kovacs. - Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1996
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 161)
ISBN 90-04-10624-3
NE: Kovacs, David

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 10624 3

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface vii

Abbreviations ix

Heraclidae 1

Hippolytus 28

Andromache 40

Hecuba 56

Supplices 70

Electra 95

Heracles 126

Troades 149

Addendum: Medea 152

Indices

Index of Subjects 157

Index of Greek Words 157

Index of Passages Cited 158

PREFACE

This volume, like its predecessor, *Euripidea* (Leiden, 1994), is a companion to the Loeb Euripides, explaining some of the readings I adopt on the left-hand pages and some of my translations on the right-hand ones. The present volume covers Loeb volumes two and three (*Heraclidae*, *Hippolytus, Andromache, Hecuba, Supplices, Electra, Heracles,* and *Troades*). A projected *Euripidea Tertia* will cover the remainder of the plays.

It may be thought late in the day to be producing volumes of *adversaria critica* on the plays of Euripides. But in actuality there is still a great deal to be done on the text. Problems, both previously recognized and new, are to be found, if not on every page, yet thick and fast enough to make a small book of the gleanings from eight plays. As I did in the earlier volume, I have intercalated references to earlier discussions of mine.

A reader of *Euripidea* remarked that printing textual discussions without a preceding lemma makes a book that is not very user-friendly. I had to agree. Accordingly I print the text of almost everything I discuss. The most convenient point of departure was Diggle's Oxford text, and unless I note otherwise, the text at the head of a discussion, along with any apparatus, is his. I have incorporated his later corrections (see his *Euripidea* 518-23) into the apparatus.

There are, as before, debts to acknowledge. Parts of this book were written during two years of half-time research made possible by a grant from the Division of Research of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The University of Virginia awarded me a summer grant that allowed me several uninterrupted months of σχολή. I am also grateful to the Warden and Fellows of All Souls College, Oxford for electing me to a Visiting Fellowship in 1994 that allowed me to spend a term in close proximity to several people who have edited or otherwise explicated tragedy with credit. I am particularly grateful to Martin West, Charles Willink, James Diggle, and Chris Pelling for *viva voce* discussion or useful written comment. On this side of the water, I have discussed problems in person or by letter with Justina Gregory, Jon Mikalson, Mary Lefkowitz, and Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Thanks to all for stimulation and correction.

My biggest debt, however, is to my wife, Judith, for her patience and supportiveness during this book's gestation. In her own work she explicates the Bible and the Fathers, but from me she has learned at first hand the truth of Eccles. 12:12, as I have from her the truth of Prov. 31:10-12.

Charlottesville, Virginia

ABBREVIATIONS

Ancient authors and works are abbreviated as in LSJ, periodicals as in *L'année philologique*, and metrical symbols as in M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982).

Andromache	P. D. Kovacs, *The Andromache of Euripides: an Interpretation* (Chico, 1980)
BICS	*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*
CJ	*Classical Journal*
CP	*Classical Philology*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
EMC	*Echos du Monde Classique*
Denniston, *GP*	J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*[2] (Oxford, 1959)
Diggle, *Studies*	J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981)
Diggle, *Euripidea*	J. Diggle, *Euripidea: Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1994)
Euripidea	D. Kovacs, *Euripidea* (Leiden, 1994)
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
Heroic Muse	D. Kovacs, *The Heroic Muse: Studies in the* Hippolytus *and* Hecuba *of Euripides* (Baltimore and London, 1987)
Jackson, *MS*	J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955)

K.-G.	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover and Leipzig, 1898)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, , *A Greek-English Lexicon,* 9th ed. rev. by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie (Oxford, 1940 et seq.)
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum*
Smyth	H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar,* revised by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass., 1956)
Stinton, *CPGT*	T. C. W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990)
TAPA	*Transactions of the American Philological Association*
Wilamowitz, *KS*	U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, 1962)

HERACLIDAE

80-3

σὺ δ' ἐκ τίνος γῆς, ὦ γέρον, τετράπτολιν
ξύνοικον ἦλθες λαόν; ἢ
πέραθεν ἁλίῳ πλάτᾳ
κατέχετ' ἐκλιπόντες Εὐβοῖδ' ἀκτάν;

'From what land have you come? Or have you come over the sea?' The alternatives are not logical, for the first question is compatible with either a mainland or an island origin for Iolaus.[1] Willink *per litteras* proposes ἦ, whose use in surmise questions can be illustrated by *Hip*. 782 φίλαι, τί δρῶμεν; ἦ δοκεῖ περᾶν δόμους; (manuscripts divided between ἦ and ἢ); *El*. 343 τίνος δ' ἕκατι . . . προσῆλθον; ἦ 'μοῦ δεόμενοι; *El*. 967 τί δῆτα δρῶμεν; μητέρ' ἦ φονεύσομεν; and *Tro*. 161 οἴ 'γώ, τί θέλουσ'; ἦ πού μ' ἤδη ναυσθλώσουσιν πατρίας ἐκ γᾶς; It has also been restored by scholars from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries at *Hcld*. 95 τί χρέος; ἦ λόγων πόλεως, ἔνεπέ μοι, μελόμενοι τυχεῖν; *Andr*. 1062, ποίαν περαίνων ἐλπίδ'; ἦ γῆμαι θέλων; *Cy*. 117, 129, 207, *Su*. 106, *El*. 559, *HF* 145, 620. At *Hec*. 1013, ποῦ δῆτα; πέπλων ἐντὸς ἢ κρύψας ἔχεις, ἢ is the reading of the manuscripts, but it makes little sense as Collard's translation shows: 'Where is it then—inside your mantle, or do you have it hidden?' These are not distinct alternatives, for if the gold is in Hecuba's clothing it is surely hidden there. Better not to take it as a disjunctive question but rather 'Where is it then? Have you hidden it in your clothing?' This meaning is achievable with ἦ, which Wecklein reports as the reading of the second hand of the Marcianus. For postponed ἦ, see *El*. 967, quoted above.

---

[1] D. J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity* (Berkeley, 1979), p. 40, n. 16, notes that the use of ἢ in a passage like ours would mean a shift from uncertainty among a multitude of possibilities to a more confident contemplation of one possible answer. He says correctly that this makes no sense at *El*. 559. The same is true here.

107-8

ἄθεον ἱκεσίαν μεθεῖναι πόλει
ξένων προστροπάν.

With the reading of L, word-order strongly suggests that πόλει is indirect object to μεθεῖναι. This is not how editors take it, of course: they construe it with ἄθεον. But we could well ask why any dative is wanted with an expression as generally valid as 'It is a godless thing'. Refusing to protect suppliants is godless *tout court*, and the attractions of Elmsley's πέλει are evident.

147-8

ἀλλ' ἤ τιν' ἐς σὲ μωρίαν ἐσκεμμένοι
δεῦρ' ἦλθον κτλ.

I know of no parallel for an expression like 'seeing some folly ἐς σὲ', the reading of L. By contrast there is a very good parallel for 'seeing some folly ἐν σοί', S. *OT* 536-7, φέρ' εἰπὲ πρὸς θεῶν, δειλίαν ἢ μωρίαν ἰδών τιν' ἐν ἐμοὶ ταῦτ' ἐβουλεύσω ποεῖν; We should read ἐν σοὶ here, as Hartung suggested. The change is not that difficult. Scribes, like other mortals, have the propensity to anticipate letters from words they know they are soon to write. If this had induced someone to write ἐς σοί, 'correction' to the reading of L could easily have followed.

165-70

ἢ κακὸν λόγον
κτήσῃ πρὸς ἀστῶν, εἰ γέροντος οὕνεκα
τύμβου, τὸ μηδὲν ὄντος, ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος,
παίδων ⟨τε⟩ τῶνδ' ἐς ἄντλον ἐμβήσῃ πόδα.
†ἐρεῖς τὸ λῷστον ἐλπίδ' εὑρήσειν μόνον†·
καὶ τοῦτο πολλῷ τοῦ παρόντος ἐνδεές.

168 ⟨τε⟩ Tr² 169 ἕξεις Diggle (cf. 521), lac. post h. v. indicata (iam indic. Musso), in qua definiretur ἐλπίς (sc. spes liberos pro sociis mox habendi: cf. Andr. 27-8) τὸ λοιπὸν Weil

I discussed this passage at *GRBS* 29 (1988), 122. I am now convinced that I took the wrong approach in suggesting that 169-70 originally read παρεὶς τὸ λῷστον ἐλπίδ' εὑρήσεις μόνον, καὶ τοῦτο πολλῷ τοῦ παρόντος ἐνδεές, 'Letting go your best interests, you will find only hope, and this falls far short of what is ready to hand'. West *per litteras* points out that ἐρεῖς in 169 looks inevitable as a way of putting an opponent's objection, and καὶ τοῦτο, 'This too', answers it. If so, we can ignore Diggle's ἕξεις for ἐρεῖς, which is hard to construe in any case. West suggests tentatively that the transmitted text can be retained with a minor change: 'You'll say that hope [=acting optimistically] is the only thing [reading μόνην] that will arrive at the best result.' This may be the least expensive way to emend, but the meaning we are obliged to give to ἐλπίδ' prevents us from being completely satisfied. We can save transmitted μόνον, give it more work to do, and give greater point to the reply in 170, if we change one letter and posit a lacuna, not at line-end but just before the last word of 168, e. g.

ἐρεῖς· Τὸ λῷστον ἐλπὶς εὑρήσειν ⟨πόλιν
ἐσθλῶν τε φιλίαν τῶνδε σωθέντων⟩ μόνον.
καὶ τοῦτο πολλῷ τοῦ παρόντος ἐνδεές.

'You will say, "There is hope that <our city> will find what is best <and the friendship of noble men> only <if these children's lives are saved." This too falls far short of present benefit.' For direct speech following ἐρεῖς, cf. *Or.* 665.

197-8

εἰ γὰρ τόδ' ἔσται καὶ λόγους κρινοῦσι σούς,
οὐκ οἶδ' Ἀθήνας τάσδ' ἐλευθέρας ἔτι.

'If this happens and they award the victory to your cause, I do not know that Athens is any longer free'. Agnosticism is somewhat weak here, and something more forceful seems to be required. Wilkins de-

fends by citing *Hec.* 397, οὐ γὰρ οἶδα δεσπότας κεκτημένος, and *Su.* 518, οὐκ οἶδ ἐγὼ Κρέοντα δεσπόζοντ' ἐμοῦ, but irony exactly suits Odysseus' 'I am not aware that I have a master' and Theseus' 'I am not aware that Creon is my master'. In both these cases, another speaker's words imply that Odysseus and Theseus must do as they are told. It seems far less appropriate here where Iolaus is not replying to another speaker. Then too the repetition of οἶδ' in precisely the same metrical position in the very next line both deepens suspicion (for it is without point) and provides an explanation for the corruption. The scribe's eye wandered momentarily to the line below. Read Kirchhoff's οὔ φημ'.

215-9

φημὶ γάρ ποτε
σύμπλους γενέσθαι τῶνδ' ὑπασπίζων πατρὶ
ζωστῆρα Θησεῖ τὸν πολυκτόνον μέτα
⟨ ⟩
⟨ ⟩
Ἅιδου τ' ἐρεμνῶν ἐξανήγαγεν μυχῶν
πατέρα σόν· Ἑλλὰς πᾶσα τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.

217 post h. v. lac. indic. Dobree

Dobree was right. Diggle correctly marks the lacuna Garzya and others fail to mark. The change between the first-person 'I claim that I sailed as right-hand man to their father with Theseus to fetch, etc.' and the third-person 'and he brought your father out of the dark recesses of Hades' is too abrupt. Too abrupt likewise is the introduction of the Hades journey: nothing signals the passage from one adventure to the other. The proper supplement, if it is to show how the passage might have looked as it left Euripides' hand, must first set the scene (Theseus' attempt to abduct Persephone) and then mention Heracles' role in the sequel.

φημὶ γάρ ποτε
σύμπλους γενέσθαι τῶνδ' ὑπασπίζων πατρὶ
ζωστῆρα Θησεῖ τὸν πολυκτόνον μέτα.
⟨ἐπεὶ δὲ Θησεὺς Πειρίθῳ πρὸς ἡδονὴν
Κόρην ἀπάξων ἦλθε Ταρτάρου βάθη,
εἰρχθέντα δεσμοῖς ἐξέλυσεν Ἡρακλῆς⟩
Ἅιδου τ' ἐρεμνῶν ἐξανήγαγεν μυχῶν
πατέρα σόν· Ἑλλὰς πᾶσα τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.

Wilkins suggests that the debt of Demophon to Heracles was that the latter gave Antiope to Theseus as the reward for his services, and that the result of this union was Demophon himself. That is possible but not inevitable. The fact that Iolaus was on the same expedition with Theseus is probably sufficient to create a debt.

219-31

Ἑλλὰς πᾶσα τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.
ὧν ἀντιδοῦναί σ' οἴδ' ἀπαιτοῦσιν χάριν,
μήτ' ἐκδοθῆναι μήτε πρὸς βίαν θεῶν
τῶν σῶν ἀποσπασθέντες ἐκπεσεῖν χθονός.
σοὶ γὰρ τόδ' αἰσχρὸν χωρὶς ἐν πόλει τ' ἴσον,
ἱκέτας ἀλήτας συγγενεῖς—οἴμοι κακῶν·
βλέψον πρὸς αὐτούς, βλέψον—ἕλκεσθαι βίᾳ.
ἀλλ' ἄντομαί σε καὶ καταστέφων χεροῖν
καὶ πρὸς γενείου, μηδαμῶς ἀτιμάσῃς
τοὺς Ἡρακλείους παῖδας ἐς χέρας λαβεῖν·
γενοῦ δὲ τοῖσδε συγγενής, γενοῦ φίλος
πατὴρ ἀδελφὸς δεσπότης· ἅπαντα γὰρ
τἄλλ' ἐστὶ κρείσσω πλὴν ὑπ' Ἀργείοις πεσεῖν.

221-2 del. Pierson: cf. 97-8   223 ἐν πόλει τ' ἴσον Jackson: ἔν τε πόλει κακόν L: ἔν τε τῇ πόλει [κακόν] Erfurdt   226 καταστέφων Diggle: -στέφω L

221-2 are an almost exact repetition of 97-8, and Pierson proposed their deletion. But the next three lines have their own problems and may also be an alien intrusion.

The first of these is in 223, where L has σοὶ γὰρ τόδ' αἰσχρὸν χωρὶς ἔν τε πόλει κακόν. This is likely to be corrupt, and it would be unwise to lay the anapest to the charge of an interpolator unless we had some good reason to think that his notions of tragic meter were so inexact.[1] The sense also provides a reason to suspect corruption since the 'shameful *to* you' and 'bad *in* the city' are not a plausible pair of concepts. To repair the damage is not easy. Jackson, *MS* 54, suggests ἐν πόλει τ' ἴσον, but despite his rhetorical flourishes, this is far from inevitable. His parallel for ἴσον, S. *OT* 1347, δείλαιε τοῦ νοῦ τῆς τε συμφορᾶς ἴσον, shows that ἴσον can be an adverb and mean 'equally', but in that case we would expect a parallelism of construction like the two genitives of cause with δείλαιε. Instead, we get, as Wilkins notes, a change of construction: σοί is dative with αἰσχρόν ('a disgrace to you'), while ἐν πόλει, whatever it means, cannot mean 'a disgrace for the city'.[2] Even if it could, the lack of parallelism in expression would have cast doubt on this line had it been transmitted with Jackson's reading. As a conjecture ἐν πόλει τ' ἴσον is surprisingly bad and certainly undeserving of a place in Diggle's text. Diggle also cites Erfurdt's conjecture, but the sense labors under the same difficulty as the reading of L (the contrast between σοὶ χωρίς and ἐν τῇ πόλει is strained and inexact), and only the meter is improved.

If, as I argue below, the line is part of an interpolation, it might be thought a waste of time to emend, but if someone has already done a plausible job of it, it would be ungrateful to leave the obeli without any remedy. Reisig's deletion of τε yields σοὶ γὰρ τόδ' αἰσχρὸν χωρὶς ἐν πόλει κακόν, 'this is a disgraceful calamity for you separately among the citizens'. Here κακόν is not an adjective but a noun meaning 'bane, calamity': cf. 255, οὔκουν ἐμοὶ τόδ' αἰσχρὸν ἀλλ' οὐ σοὶ βλάβος; 'Is this injury not a disgrace to me rather than to you?' where αἰσχρόν modifies βλάβος. The τε will have been inserted by

---

[1] The anapests at the end of *IA* are clearly a different matter, for they presumably come from a period when Porson's law was also not felt to be binding. At *TAPA* 109 (1979), 118, I argue that an anapest is genuine in a passage I believe to be of Imperial date. But it would be unwise to leave anapests uncorrected in all interpolated matter.

[2] Wilkins' attempt to make the prepositional phrase mean 'with regard to the city', i.e. with disadvantage to the city, is not convincing. All his examples have adjectives or nouns in the masculine gender such as δεινός, ὑβριστής, θρασύς or expressions like χεῖρα χραίνεσθαι φόνῳ, and they are far from proving that αἰσχρὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει can mean 'shameful *to*, i.e. to the disadvantage of, the city'.

someone who failed to understand that κακόν was not a second adjective parallel to αἰσχρόν.

That done, we may consider the shortcomings in the passage that cannot be put to the account of scribes. The bathetic parenthesis in 224-5 far exceeds the bounds of what is possible for a supplicating character in Euripides to say, and Wilkins can offer no parallel. In addition it lays *Alc.* 390 (βλέψον πρὸς αὐτούς, βλέψον) under contribution. Furthermore, these three lines steal the thunder from the real crescendo of 226-31. I suggest that an actor, to whom the virtues of restraint and economy were foreign, found the calm statement of the facts of obligation, which ends at 220, too tame for his taste, borrowed 221-2, and fabricated the rest to help raise the emotional temperature. Dindorf deleted 223-5, and Paley, following Pierson and Dindorf, 221-5. I adopt the latter excision.

320-2

ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ζῶν καὶ θανών, ὅταν θάνω,
πολλῷ σ' ἐπαίνῳ Θησέως, ὦ τᾶν, πέλας
ὑψηλὸν ἀρῶ καὶ λέγων τάδ' εὐφρανῶ, κτλ.

320 θάνω Brodaeus: θάνης L

Wilkins devotes his note on 321 to discussing the tone in tragedy of ὦ τᾶν. He finds that it usually carries a tone of 'condescension or impatience or urgency', a view of the expression borne out by S. *OT* 1145 (Corinthian messenger to Theban shepherd), ὅδ' ἐστίν, ὦ τᾶν, κεῖνος ὃς τότ' ἦν νέος, *Ba.* 802 (Dionysus to Pentheus), ὦ τᾶν, ἔτ' ἔστιν εὖ καταστῆναι τάδε, and *Hcld.* 688 (servant to Iolaus), οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦ τᾶν, ἥ ποτ' ἦν ῥώμη σέθεν. This kind of tone seems inappropriate here, and Wilkins' half-hearted attempt to defend it carries little conviction.

It is not, however, merely the tone of the word that is problematical. It occupies a place in the line that we require for other purposes, and it is plain that at some stage of the transmission ὅταν was copied from 320 by mistake, thereby obliterating a necessary word. We need a participle to govern Θησέως πέλας, and Broadhead's ἑστὼς is as good a guess as any could be. There may be another word of

iambic or spondaic shape that would also do, but I have not been able to think of it.

That does not end our difficulties, however. First is the curious imbalance of 'in life and in death when I die'. Expression such as 'in life and in death' are not rare in Euripides (cf. 599, *Alc*. 141, *Hip*. 1193, *Tro*. 175, *IT* 718, *Rhes*. 915, fr. 852.2, ascribed to *Hcld*.), and when both participles form a part of the same clause, we do not find one of them arbitrarily amplified by a temporal clause. What is even more telling, καὶ ζῶν καὶ θανών, ὅταν θάνω makes no sense with what follows, for while Iolaus *in death* will have the opportunity to stand next to Theseus and sing the praises of Demophon, this cannot happen while he is still alive. I diagnose a lacuna:

ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ζῶν ⟨εὐγενῆ σ' οὐ παύσομαι
πᾶσιν προφαίνων,⟩ καὶ θανών, ὅταν θάνω,
πολλῷ σ' ἐπαίνῳ Θησέως ἑστὼς πέλας
ὑψηλὸν ἀρῶ καὶ λέγων τάδ' εὐφρανῶ, κτλ.

Cf. *HF* 1329-33:

ταῦτ' ἐπωνομασμένα
σέθεν τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκ βροτῶν κεκλήσεται
ζῶντος· θανόντα δ', εὖτ' ἂν εἰς Ἅιδου μόλῃς,
θυσίαισι λαΐνοισί τ' ἐξογκώμασιν
τίμιον ἀνάξει πᾶσ' Ἀθηναίων πόλις.

The parallelism is exact, for this passage too shows two participles, one meaning 'alive' and the other 'dead', belonging to two different main clauses and also shows the second modified by 'when you die'.

377-80

ἀλλ', ὦ πολέμων ἐρα-
στά, μή μοι δορὶ συνταρά-
ξῃς τὰν εὖ χαρίτων ἔχου-
σαν πόλιν, ἀλλ' ἀνάσχου.

377 ἐραστά Musgrave: -στάς L

Diggle's colometry is superior to Garzya's. Without the dovetailing exhibited above, the passage breaks up into four separate periods since period-end, according to the Stinton rule, takes place when catalexis is followed by short or anceps in the following line.[1] But if so, we must reject Musgrave's otherwise attractive ἐραστά. Buijs has shown that the initial anaclasis of long and anceps in aeolic meters is rare where overlap occurs.[2] By contrast nominative for vocative can certainly be retained.

558-63

σοφῶς †κελεύεις†· μὴ τρέσῃς μιάσματος
τοὐμοῦ μετασχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρως θάνω, 559
ἐπεὶ σφαγῆς γε πρὸς τὸ δεινὸν εἶμ' ἐγώ, 562
εἴπερ πέφυκα πατρὸς οὗπερ εὔχομαι. 563
ἕπου δέ, πρέσβυ· σῇ γὰρ ἐνθανεῖν χερὶ 560
θέλω, πέπλοις δὲ σῶμ' ἐμὸν κρύψον παρών, 561

558 ἔλεξας Nauck: παραινεῖς Rauchenstein 562-3 post 559 trai. Schenkl

In 558 either Nauck's or Rauchenstein's conjecture gives good sense: 'Your words are wise'. The origin of κελεύεις is easy to see, κελεύω two lines above.

Thereafter we encounter problems of meaning and grammar. In reply to Iolaus' 'I neither urge you nor forbid you to die, but you will benefit your brothers if you do', the Maiden is supposed to say 'Your words are wise. Do not be afraid of sharing in the stain of my death, *but let me die freely*'. There are two objections: (1) Grammatically, this use of the subjunctive is in an important respect without real parallel. Cited as a witness by Wilkins *ad loc.*, Barrett on *Hip*. 567 (ἐπίσχετ', αὐδὴν τῶν ἔσωθεν ἐκμάθω) says 'this voluntative 1st-pers. subjve. is used when the performance of an action which the speaker wishes to perform depends, or when he affects it to depend, on the compliance of those he is addressing; it is used freely in the plur. . . .,

[1] See Stinton, 'Pause and Period in the Lyrics of Greek Tragedy', *CPGT* 325-7 (=*CQ* 27 [1977], 38-40).
[2] See J. A. J. M. Buijs, *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985), 74-92.

but in the sing. it is (when affirmative) used only after an impve. requesting the compliance required'. But in none of the examples cited by Barrett, Wilkins, K.-G. i.219-20, Schwyzer ii.314, or Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*[3], (Basel, Boston, Stuttgart, 1981), i.233 is the initial imperative separated from the subjunctive by ἀλλά. (2) Even more important is the sense. When Polyxena asks to be allowed to die freely, she is requesting that the soldiers not seize her and thereby treat her as a slave. But Heracles' daughter is not making such a request. That she is dying freely and of her own will has already been made clear. That is true whether or not Iolaus consents to her immediately preceding request not to be afraid of pollution, so that the ἀλλά which makes the sentence grammatically anomalous is also logically misleading. If we are extremely tolerant, we might translate 'Do not be be afraid of sharing in the stain of my death, but I mean to die of my own free will (and hence cause no pollution)'. Still, the ἀλλά is troubling, and the use of the subjunctive as quasi-future is without any parallel in post-Homeric Greek.

Since neither sense nor grammar is satisfied by the reading of L, we must ask what we expect Macaria to say, and I find that expectation is exactly satisfied by A. Palmer's ἀλλ' ἐλευθερῶ σ' ἐγώ: 'Do not be afraid of the stain of my death, but I set you free from it'. While 'for' might have been expected instead of 'but', the contrast is between the fear of pollution and its actual absence.

Schenkl's transposition of 562-3 to follow 559 has nothing inevitable about it, and the reading of L should be retained, though a well-placed parenthesis does a bit to improve the style:

σοφῶς ἔλεξας· μὴ τρέσῃς μιάσματος
τοὐμοῦ μετασχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλευθερῶ σ' ἐγώ.
ἕπου δέ, πρέσβυ (σῇ γὰρ ἐνθανεῖν χερὶ
θέλω) πέπλοις δὲ σῶμ' ἐμὸν κρύψον παρών
(ἐπεὶ σφαγῆς γε πρὸς τὸ δεινὸν εἶμ' ἐγώ),
εἴπερ πέφυκα πατρὸς οὗπερ εὔχομαι.

'Your words are wise. Do not be afraid that you will be partaker of the stain of my blood. Instead, I set you free from it. But come with me, old man (for I wish to die in your arms) and stand by me and

cover my dead body with my garments (for I am going to the terror of slaughter), if indeed I am sprung from the man I claim as father.'

572-6

ἀλλ', εἴ τι βούλῃ, τούσδε τὸν γέροντά τε
χώρει προσειποῦσ' ὑστάτοις προσφθέγμασιν.
Πα. ὦ χαῖρε, πρέσβυ, χαῖρε καὶ δίδασκέ μοι
τοιούσδε τούσδε παῖδας, ἐς τὸ πᾶν σοφούς,
ὥσπερ σύ, μηδὲν μᾶλλον· ἀρκέσουσι γάρ.

573 ὑστάτοις προσφθέγμασιν Blomfield: ὕστατον πρόσφθεγμά μοι L

It is just as good Greek to say προσειπεῖν τινά τι as προσειπεῖν τινά τινι, and there is no pressing reason to alter transmitted ὕστατον. Hermann's ὕστατον προσφθεγμάτων gives good sense, and the corruption is easily explicable: L's μοι betrays the influence of the very next line.

619-20

ἀλλὰ σὺ μὴ προπεσὼν τὰ θεῶν φέρε μηδ' ὑπεράλγει
φροντίδα λύπᾳ·

619 φέρε Elmsley: ὕπερ L

Elmsley's φέρε should be regarded as *exempli gratia* for the meaningless ὕπερ of L. It is only one possibility, and if we adopt it, the μὴ has to be taken exclusively with the participle. Lesky's στένε is superior: 'Do not fall prostrate and lament the gods' dispensation, do not grieve excessively in your heart'. West cites Archil. 128.5 W., μηδὲ νικηθεὶς ἐν οἴκῳ καταπεσὼν ὀδύρεο.

637-41

Θε. ἥκω γε μέντοι χάρμα σοι φέρων μέγα.
Ιο. τίς δ' εἶ σύ; ποῦ σοι συντυχὼν ἀμνημονῶ;

Θε. Ὕλλου πενέστης· οὔ με γιγνώσκεις ὁρῶν;
Ιο. ὦ φίλταθ', ἥκεις ἆρα σωτὴρ νῷν βλάβης;
Θε. μάλιστα· καὶ πρός γ' εὐτυχεῖς τὰ νῦν τάδε.

640 ἥκεις apogr. Par.: ἧκες L   νῷν σωτὴρ Porson

This section revises what I said at *GRBS* 29 (1988), 122-3. As printed by Diggle, neither Iolaus' question nor the Servant's answer gives very satisfactory sense. 'Dear friend, have you come then as a savior from harm to us twain?' Why, we might ask, is the rescue from harm restricted only to two persons? Why indeed is the bearer of the news that Hyllus has returned treated as if he had the rescuing property of Hyllus himself? 'Indeed, I have. And, what is more, you are enjoying good fortune now'. We may be surprised that the Servant accepts the exaggerated view of his role, but we can let that pass. But in what respect does the line's second sentence add anything to the first? If he has arrived as savior from harm, as he admits, how can he add—as an explicitly additional point—that Iolaus is enjoying good fortune?

In 1988 I conjectured ἧκεν ἆρα σῶς κἄτερ βλάβης. I was annoyed at having to write the imperfect (which usually has the force of a pluperfect) of the verb ἥκω, but I had L's ἧκες as a half-way house, and there seemed no other way to avoid ἥκεις, which I thought was wrong.

Charles Willink, however, came to my rescue. He proposed ἥκετ' ἆρα σῷ κἄτερ βλάβης. The second person plural embraces both the Servant and Hyllus' company, and the sense is unimpeachable: 'Have you then all come back safe and sound?' This was Iolaus' first concern, that something might have happened to Hyllus. The Servant sets him straight on this point with a crisp μάλιστα before imparting news that is genuinely additional: 'What is more, we arrive in state of good fortune at the moment'. (The reference is to the new forces Hyllus brought with him.) εὐτυχεῖς can now function as an adjective rather than a second-person singular verb: cf. 792. The corruption was caused by haplography, CΩIKATEP read as CΩITEP and then as CΩTHP. The line then was a syllable short and attracted the dative pronoun, dual because the plural wouldn't scan. The convenient dual

pronoun was elsewhere pressed into service by someone trying to emend as best he could: see Jackson, *MS* 81-2.

661-3

ἀτὰρ τί χώρᾳ τῇδε προσβαλὼν πόδα
ποῦ νῦν ἄπεστι; τίς νιν εἶργε συμφορὰ
σὺν σοὶ φανέντα δεῦρ' ἐμὴν τέρψαι φρένα;

Bond on *Hypsipyle*, fr. 64.83 discusses so-called double questions, cases such as τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; where both 'Who are you?' and 'Where do you come from?' are compressed into a single question. He cites *Alc.* 213, *El.* 779, *Ion* 793, *Hel.* 1543, and *Pho.* 1553. None of them is a parallel to the present passage. *Ex uno disce omnes*: *Hel.* 1543 reads πῶς ἐκ τίνος νεὼς ποτε 'Αχαιίδος θραύσαντες ἥκετε σκάφος; Neither this nor the other passages offers a parallel for one interrogative word being part of a participial phrase and the second not. Furthermore the sense is deficient. For Alcmene cannot be asking why Hyllus has come to this land. The answer to that is obvious (he set out from here and is returning after his errand), and it would never occur to anyone to ask it. The 'why?' question that needs answering is 'Why, having once set foot on this land, has he not come to see me?' That is the sense of what Euripides must have written, though his wording can only be approximately recovered:

ἀτὰρ τί χώρᾳ τῇδε προσβαλὼν πόδα
⟨πατρὸς προσελθεῖν μητέρ' ὧδ' ἀναίνεται;⟩
ποῦ νῦν ἄπεστι; τίς νιν εἶργε συμφορὰ
σὺν σοὶ φανέντα δεῦρ' ἐμὴν τέρψαι φρένα;

664-6

Θε. στρατὸν καθίζει τάσσεταί θ' ὃν ἦλθ' ἔχων.
Αλ. τοῦδ' οὐκέθ' ἡμῖν τοῦ λόγου μέτεστι δή.
Ιο. μέτεστιν· ἡμῶν δ' ἔργον ἱστορεῖν τάδε.

The text of L is defensible. Alcmene says 'This last report is no concern of ours', and Iolaus contradicts her and assumes the role of interrogator. But it seems on balance more likely that Alcmene's ἡμῖν means ἐμοί, for the only reason she would have for claiming that the report was of no concern is that she is a woman and, as Hector put it, πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει. (Cf. also 711.) In that case, we don't expect Iolaus to contradict her but merely to tell her that the report does concerns himself. Perhaps Euripides wrote μέτεστι δ' ἡμῖν· τοὐμὸν ἱστορεῖν τάδε. If some scribe offered a helpful ἔργον in explanation of τοὐμὸν and gloss displaced text, the resulting line could have tempted someone to change ἡμῖν to a genitive and to reposition the δέ.

709-13

Αλ. τί χρῆμα μέλλεις σῶν φρενῶν οὐκ ἔνδον ὢν
λιπεῖν μ' ἔρημον σὺν ⟨τέκνου⟩ τέκνοις ἐμοῖς;
Ιο. ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἀλκή· σοὶ δὲ χρὴ τούτων μέλειν.
Αλ. τί δ'; ἢν θάνῃς σύ, πῶς ἐγὼ σωθήσομαι;
Ιο. παιδὸς μελήσει παισὶ τοῖς λελειμμένοις.

710 ⟨τέκνου⟩ Vitelli 713 παισὶ Canter: πᾶσι L

The present paragraphs revise what I said at *GRBS* 29 (1988), 123-4. Iolaus' answer in 711 contains a γάρ, and accordingly we are obligated to translate it, 'Yes, for defense is the business of men. You must care for these children'. Accordingly, he cannot have been asked a question introduced by 'Why?' and we must punctuate after τί χρῆμα, as was first suggested by G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester, 1955), p. 36, n. 3. As an independent sentence, τί χρῆμα; is frequently preceded by ἔα, but for examples of τί χρῆμα; 'What is this?' without ἔα, see *Hip*. 876 and *El*. 751.

In 713 we do not want a reference to 'your remaining grandchildren'. Coming right after, 'If you die, how shall I survive?' a reference to her being cared for by her 'remaining grandchildren' would suggest that Iolaus was in this relation with her, which is not the case. Wilkins thinks that the qualification 'remaining' is added in view of Macaria's death. But a granddaughter is not a likely person

to save Alcmene's life, and the qualification that would exclude her from our thoughts is otiose. The phrase παιδὸς παισί should mean grandsons, not grandchildren, where it is a question of someone's life being saved. Read τῶν λελειμμένων: 'Your grandsons will care for those I have left behind'. On this showing μελήσει is construed as an impersonal. False adjustment of case endings is a form of corruption easy to illustrate.

732-3

Ιο. ἔπειγε· λειφθεὶς δεινὰ πείσομαι μάχης.
Θε. σύ τοι βραδύνεις, οὐκ ἐγώ, δοκῶν τι δρᾶν.

733 δοκῶν Tyrwhitt: δοκῶ L

This discussion revises my earlier one at *GRBS* 29 (1988), 124. Iolaus says, 'Hurry! I will be annoyed if I miss the battle!' To this the Servant is supposed to reply, 'It is you who are slow, not I, in seeming to do something', or 'thinking you are doing something'. I cannot see what δοκῶν τι δρᾶν adds to the first five words, and this feeble sense is arrived at by conjecture, Tyrwhitt's δοκῶν for L's δοκῶ. Tyrwhitt assumes that parenthetic οὐκ ἐγώ caused the next verb to be made first-person, but there is more than one possible original that could have been so altered. The original of L's δοκῶ might have been δοκεῖς, resuming the second person after the first-person parenthesis.[1] Then all that remains is to change βραδύνεις to an infinitive: σύ τοι βραδύνειν, οὐκ ἐγώ, δοκεῖς τι δρᾶν, 'It is you, not I, who seem to be slow to do something'. For βραδύνω construed with an infinitive, see A. *Sept.* 623.

729-33: See *GRBS* 29 (1988), 124.

788-9

ὦ φίλταθ', ἥδε σ' ἡμέρα †διήλασεν†·
ἠλευθέρωσαι τοῖσδε τοῖς ἀγγέλμασιν.

---

[1] For similar parentheses see *Andr.* 248 and *Hipp.* 352. See further, for parentheses as cause of corruption, Jackson, *MS* 128-40.

788 διώλβισεν dubitanter Diggle cl. Ph. 1689 789 ἠλευθέρωσαι Jackson: ἐλευθερῶσαι L: ἠλευθερῶσθαι L^s: ἐλευθερῶ σε Diggle

Diggle's conjecture wears a fairly desperate look, and transmitted διήλασεν is impossible. 'This day has brought you through' would be possible if destination (and possibly also point of departure) were expressed. Wilkins suggests a lacuna to follow 788, and this seems promising. Sense might have been expressed by, e. g.

ὦ φίλταθ', ἥδε σ' ἡμέρα διήλασεν
⟨ἐλευθέρων ἐς ἀριθμὸν ἐξ ὑπηρετῶν⟩.

961-1055

There is a great deal of what one must frankly call incoherence at the end of the play. Most of it has received scant, if any, attention from previous scholars, an indication of the low expectations with which editors approach the text of one of Euripides' least loved plays. The only part that has been closely scrutinized is the very end, where Alcmene's remarkable suggestion that Eurystheus' body be thrown to the dogs—in spite of his prophecy that he will receive burial near Pallene, become a hero, and confer great benefits on the Athenians—is instantly accepted by the Chorus. The response of editors to this has by and large been to mark a lacuna after 1052 in which a debate could have taken place between Alcmene and the Chorus or between two semi-choruses on the propriety of Alcmene's suggestion, with the final anapests approving, presumably, the decision not to leave Eurystheus unburied. I will give reasons for thinking this a bad solution. Meanwhile something must be said about the other difficulties on which scarcely anyone has commented.

Eurystheus is escorted on by the servant of Hyllus who brought Iolaus the news that Heracles' son had returned with new allies. In the immediately preceding scene a messenger had told Alcmene that Eurystheus had been captured and that his life had been spared so that she might have the pleasure of seeing her enemy, who had long enjoyed unjust prosperity, in a state of misery and ruin. Now he is brought on by the Servant, and she delivers a denunciation of what he has done, his persecution both of Heracles while he lived and of

his family now that he is dead. She indicates that he must soon be put to death.

At this point the Servant[1] announces that Eurystheus may not be killed, and Alcmene objects strenuously. The discussion culminates in Alcmene's assertion that she will kill Eurystheus whether or not the city approves.

Then Eurystheus makes a speech in which he refuses to beg for his life and defends his actions as the prudent measures that anyone in his position would have adopted in dealing with an enemy like Heracles. He ends by saying that since the Athenians and their allies did not kill him but spared his life contrary to his wish at the time, the laws of Greece make his execution a source of pollution to the one who executes him. Athens' action in letting him go (ἀφῆκε, to be taken literally, or merely as 'spare his life'?) was σωφροσύνη, he says, and 'honoring the god' (which god?) 'far more than my enmity'. There follows a pair of lines, 1014-5, whose sense has been totally obscured by corruption. Eurystheus ends by saying that while he does not want to die, he will not be at all vexed at leaving life.

The Chorus-leader then offers advice to Alcmene: let Eurystheus go since that is the city's will. Alcmene suggests that there is a way in which Eurystheus can be killed and the city's wishes obeyed. The Chorus-leader wants to know more. 'I shall kill him and then give his corpse to those of his near and dear who come to fetch it. As regards his body, I shall not be disobedient to the land, yet he will die and give me satisfaction for his crimes.' It must be said bluntly that this is nonsense. The city's will in this matter is that he shall not be killed. There is a further suggestion in 1012 that not killing him means releasing him to go his way, but nothing has been said thus far about giving him to his near and dear: the only formulation we have of the city's will is 'Don't kill Eurystheus'. If Euripides wants Alcmene to propose some sophistical reinterpretation of the will of the Athenians, whereby instead of releasing the live Eurystheus she merely surrenders his dead body, ought he not to have taken the trouble to lay the basis for this move earlier in the play? Murray notes this discrepancy and marks a lacuna before 1018. Into this lacuna he inserts a whole scene in which a messenger comes to announce that the city

[1] Editors are right to reject L's attributions in 961ff.: see Wilkins *ad loc*.

has decreed Eurystheus shall be released. This is a desperate suggestion, but I don't think it overestimates the difficulty.

Before the Chorus-leader can respond to Alcmene's proposal one way or the other, Eurystheus says to Alcmene, 'Kill on, I do not beg you not to'. He then tells the city that since the Athenians have let him go and have shrunk from killing him, he will make them a present of an ancient oracle of Apollo which says that he must be buried near Pallene and become a chthonic presence friendly to the Athenians and hostile to the descendants of Heracles, who will forget the gratitude they owe the Athenians and march against Athens. He will benefit the Athenians, he says, and harm the Spartans, and thus his death will be a double blessing to Athens. It is a slight oddity that he tells the Athenians not to let any libations or blood drip down into his tomb—such libations were the usual offering for a hero—and then proceeds in the next sentence to say 'in return for this' as if he had just spoken of a positive benefit. I return to this point below.

Alcmene, according to the Laurentianus, then proposes, in light of the fact that the man is her enemy and that his death will help Athens, to kill him and then give his body to the dogs. This bears no resemblance, of course, to her earlier sophistical suggestion that the body be released to his kin, but perhaps the time for such a suggestion has passed since Eurystheus has so firmly declared that he must be buried in Attic soil, and the return of the body to Argos would be a clear contradiction of this. What is most remarkable is that the benefits to Athens, in view of which she is recommending this course of action to the Athenians, clearly depend upon Eurystheus' being *buried* in Attic territory, for only thus can he be a hero and a chthonic presence (κείσομαι κατὰ χθονός). Yet if L is to be believed, she suddenly and without warning recommends a course of action that is unnecessary to her own sense of justice as it has been expressed thus far (see 1025) and incompatible with the benefits by which she is commending her proposal to the Athenians.

Let us take the last problem first. Here are 1045-55.

τί δῆτα μέλλετ', εἰ πόλει σωτηρίαν
κατεργάσασθαι τοῖσί τ' ἐξ ὑμῶν χρεών,
κτείνειν τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδ', ἀκούοντες τάδε;
δείκνυσι γὰρ κέλευθον ἀσφαλεστάτην·

ἐχθρὸς μὲν ἀνήρ, ὠφελεῖ δὲ κατθανών.
κομίζετ' αὐτόν, δμῶες, εἶτα χρὴ κυσὶν
δοῦναι κτανόντας· μὴ γὰρ ἐλπίσῃς ὅπως
αὖθις πατρῴας ζῶν ἔμ' ἐκβαλεῖς χθονός.
⟨ ⟩
⟨ ⟩
⟨ ⟩
Χο. ταῦτα δοκεῖ μοι. στείχετ', ὀπαδοί.
τὰ γὰρ ἐξ ἡμῶν
καθαρῶς ἔσται βασιλεῦσιν.

1052 post h. v. lac. indic. Hermann

Between us and an ending that is fully believable stand five Greek letters, κυσίν. If we insist on keeping them, we shall have the nonsense I described above, where Alcmene urges exposing Eurystheus' corpse and recommends this to the Athenians because of benefits to them that can only be achieved by giving him a burial. The price is far too high, and if we are willing to alter the last word of 1050, we can avoid a lacuna to which nothing else in the passage points.

Alcmene's speech to the Chorus urges the *killing* of Eurystheus, not the exposure of his body, and it is closely tied to Eurystheus' immediately preceding speech, both by the opening particle δῆτα and by the reference to the benefits the city will derive from this death. Its last sentence, introduced by γάρ, gives a reason for putting Eurystheus to death, not for exposing his corpse. It is in this light that we must understand 1050-1. Alcmene orders the servants who have custody of Eurystheus to take him away. This order is echoed in 1053 by the Chorus, prima facie evidence, one might think, that there is no lacuna here.[1] Since the servants are under Alcmene's own con-

[1] The great name of Hermann appears in Diggle's apparatus as the authority for this lacuna. The facts, however, are these. Hermann never published this suggestion. It is a hand-written comment recorded by Matthiae, *Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1824), vol. viii, p. 257, who also records that the purpose of this lacuna was to accommodate news of the death of Macaria and the honors she was to receive. It is not even certain that Hermann thought the loss occurred after 1052 rather than after 1055: Matthiae, after a note on ταῦτα (1053), says 'In fine haec notavit Hermann. in not. MSS.'. It seems temerarious even to write 'post h. v. lac. indic. Hermann' on the basis of evidence like this.

trol—being her grandson's soldiers, presumably—and since she is taking the responsibility for killing Eurystheus and is not involving the people of Athens, the acquiescence of the Chorus-leader is understandable. Eurystheus in his first speech had said that he would not be vexed at being killed. In his second, he says 'Kill away', and in the next breath indicates that he still regards Athens in a favorable light even if he is killed by Alcmene. He indicates that his death and burial at Pallene are fated and will bring great benefit to Athens. By the terms of 1010-1 any pollution involved in his death would accrue solely to the killer, in this case Alcmene. His very last words are 'by my death I shall help you and harm these people'. It is really not hard to see why the Chorus-leader, speaking for Athens, is willing to allow a death which (a) is fated, (b) brings them great benefit and their enemies great harm, and (c) does not involve them personally in pollution.

Throwing him to the dogs, however, is another matter, and it remains to fix 1050-1. We may accept or decline Madvig's ἔνθα for L's εἶτα. It is true, as Diggle notes, that κομίζετ' does not require a destination to be spelled out (he compares *Hip.* 1265 and *Hec.* 432). It is slightly odd, if χρή is coordinate with κομίζετ' rather than subordinate to it, that of two commands, one is expressed by an imperative, the other by an impersonal, and slightly easier if we can translate, 'Take him off, servants, to the place where we are fated to kill him etc'. But εἶτα is not impossible. What must be changed is the last word of 1050. We might as well admit at once that it may prove irrecoverable. Those who have made suggestions include Elmsley (πυρί), M. Haupt (τάφῳ), Housman (κόνει), and Willink (πόλει).[1] These give unexceptionable sense, especially with Madvig's ἔνθα: 'Take him off, servants, to the place where it is fated that we should kill and bury him', or, in the case of Willink's conjecture, 'kill him and make a gift of him to the city'. The lack of any explanation for the intrusion of κυσίν into the text has deprived these other-

---

[1] Elmsley's suggestion was made in his commentary *ad loc.*, though he puts it forward tentatively and canvasses the idea that the absurdities he accurately describes might after all be Euripides' doing rather than that of his copyists. Haupt, *Opuscula* (Leipzig, 1876), iii.603 (=*Hermes* 8 [1874], 2), firmly rejects Elmsley's weak agnosticism. Housman's remarks are unpublished: the notes he sent to Murray (see Murray's preface to his Tomus I, p. xi) have apparently been lost. Willink's suggestion was a personal comment to me.

wise good suggestions of full persuasiveness. Yet that in no way vitiates the strong case against κυσίν.

Fortunately there is another solution involving much less change. No one has noticed that there is more than one possible way to construe δοῦναι: not only 'having killed him give him to X' but also 'having killed him give X to him'. Understanding a pronoun in two different cases or in a case different from an expressed pronoun is common enough. Once this is realized, the way is clear for a different solution: 'Take him away, servants, and then you must kill him and give him X'. The only X that we can imagine giving Eurystheus after his death is the kind of offering that was customary for the dead, especially the powerful, heroized dead. Read χύσιν, the very word Aeschylus uses at *Cho.* 97 for the libation to be poured on Agamemnon's tomb. It is a rare word and differs by only a letter from what is transmitted. Such a libation was mentioned by Eurystheus in the context of his burial at Pallene, and though the expression is somewhat abrupt, it is still intelligible. We might do well also to consider altering κτανόντας to θανόντι, as Willink suggested to me.

The only objection to this that I can think of is that, as noted already, Eurystheus seems at 1040-4 oddly to have forbidden libations to his tomb. To this passage we must now turn.

> ἀλλὰ μήτε μοι χοὰς
> μήθ' αἷμ' ἐάσητ' εἰς ἐμὸν στάξαι τάφον.
> κακὸν γὰρ αὐτοῖς νόστον ἀντὶ τῶνδ' ἐγὼ
> δώσω· διπλοῦν δὲ κέρδος ἕξετ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ·
> ὑμᾶς τ' ὀνήσω τούσδε τε βλάψω θανών.

Libations, as already noted, are regular for the dead and especially for the heroized dead, and ἀντὶ τῶνδ' in 1042 reads as if he was speaking of some positive benefit. Yet the lines strangely appear to forbid libations. Wilkins canvasses two possibilities, for which he cites parallels. The lines might mean that the Athenians are not to allow the Heraclids to make offerings to him. He cites *Erechtheus*, fr. 65.87-9 Austin, but this is quite explicit about πολέμιοι not sacrificing. He wisely supposes that since the Heraclids have not been mentioned since 1035 this is an unlikely possibility. His second suggestion, however, is not much better, that the passage describes re-

strictions made on the cult of Eurystheus. He cites the end of the *OC*, but there it is a question of Oedipus' tomb being secret, and nothing is said about offerings to it one way or the other, except that Theseus must carry them out. He cites the *Erechtheus*, where mention is made of wineless libations, but to pour a libation without wine is not the same as to pour none at all, and it would appear that χοάς in 1040 forbids all libation of any kind, a most unusual state of affairs. Surely to be rejected is an idea briefly canvassed by Emily Kearns that Euripides gave Eurystheus no cult because this is a purely fictional *aition*: he has gone to too much trouble locating the burial in Pallene (near a temple of Heracles, in fact) for us to accept this.

Surely in light of ἀντὶ τῶνδ' in 1042 we are entitled to expect that the Athenians are to render Eurystheus some positive service and not merely keep him on a fast. There are three ways of achieving this meaning: (1) reinterpret ἐάσητ', (2) change ἐάσητ'to the aorist subjunctive of some other verb, such as ὀκνήσητ', or (3) change στάξαι to some other infinitive. For the last I can think of nothing plausible, so I leave it aside. As for the first, it might be possible to interpret ἐάσητ' as 'Do not *omit* to drip libations and blood on my tomb'. This is the way the E. A. Beck and C. E. S. Headlam edition of *Heraclidae* (Cambridge, 1895), ad loc., takes it. The evidence for ἐάω with infinitive in this sense, though not terribly plentiful, is real. See *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, 2 (B-Λ), col. 383, ἐάω B 1d, citing Φ 221, ἔασον (sc. die Tr[oer] in mir zu töten) and Ω 71 κλέψαι μὲν (Hectors Leiche) ἐάσομεν (ἀμήχανον v.l.), and also ξ 444. See also Hes. *Op*. 340, τὸν φιλέοντ' ἐπὶ δαῖτα καλεῖν, τὸν δ' ἐχθρὸν ἐᾶσαι (sc. καλεῖν), Thuc. 2.36, where μακρηγορεῖν should probably be construed with ἐάσω as well as with βουλόμενος, and Hdt. 3.134, ἐπὶ Σκύθας ἰέναι . . . ἔασον. From tragedy we have S. *OC* 593, ὅταν μάθῃς μου νουθέτει, τανῦν δ' ἔα, where ἔα apparently means ἔα νουθετεῖν, refrain from admonishing. It is a rare but exampled usage, and the context, one could argue, would have made the meaning 'Do not omit to drip libations and blood on my tomb' intelligible.

The alternative is to change ἐάσητ' to some other verb. The sense we need is 'do not omit', 'do not refuse', 'do not cease', 'do not delay', 'do not grow weary of', or the like. We could write μήθ' αἷμ' ὀκνήσητ', μήθ' αἷμ' ἀπόστητ' (cf. *Hel*. 536, where ἀπέστην is construed with an infinitive), or μήθ' αἷμα λήξητ'. All give good sense,

but the corruption is hard to explain. On balance I am inclined to keep the reading of L, though I could equally have decided, in Housman's wonderfully paradoxical phrase, timorously to alter what I might without temerity have defended.

The inconsistency between Alcmene's sophistical way of satisfying the will of the Athenians and the earlier statement of that will is the next topic. The passage where the will of the Athenians not to kill Eurystheus is first mentioned is 961ff. The passage has several problems. Here is Diggle's text.

Θε. οὐκ ἔστ' ἀνυστὸν τόνδε σοι κατακτανεῖν.
Αλ. ἄλλως ἄρ' αὐτὸν αἰχμάλωτον εἵλομεν.
εἴργει δὲ δὴ τίς τόνδε μὴ θνῄσκειν νόμος;
Θε. τοῖς τῆσδε χώρας προστάταισιν οὐ δοκεῖ.
Αλ. τί δὴ τόδ'; ἐχθροὺς τοισίδ' οὐ καλὸν κτανεῖν;
Θε. οὐχ ὅντιν' ἄν γε ζῶνθ' ἕλωσιν ἐν μάχῃ.
Αλ. καὶ ταῦτα δόξανθ' Ὕλλος ἐξηνέσχετο;
Θε. χρῆν αὐτόν, οἶμαι, τῇδ' ἀπιστῆσαι χθονί.
Αλ. χρῆν τόνδε μὴ ζῆν μηδ' †ὁρᾶν φάος ἔτι†.
Θε. τότ' ἠδικήθη πρῶτον οὐ θανὼν ὅδε.
Αλ. οὔκουν ἔτ' ἐστὶν ἐν καλῷ δοῦναι δίκην;
Θε. οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτον ὅστις ἂν κατακτάνοι.
Αλ. ἔγωγε· καίτοι φημὶ κἄμ' εἶναί τινα.

We need not linger over the speaker-attributions, since Wilkins' discussion makes the impossibility of L's speaker-names evident. The attributions printed in Diggle's OCT, due jointly to Barnes and Tyrwhitt, must be correct.

We turn instead to a trio of lacunae that have been diagnosed in this stichomythia, one by Kirchhoff after 962 and two by Zuntz on either side of 970. It cannot be demonstrated with geometric certainty that lines once stood in these three places that have not survived the ravages of time, but on grounds of grammar and sense the supposition is highly attractive. It also provides us with a way of ridding ourselves of the contradiction between Alcmene's sophism and the will of the Athenians that she reinterprets.

Kirchhoff suggested that between 962 and 963, both belonging to Alcmene, must have stood a line belonging to the Servant. The collocation δὲ δή doesn't necessitate a change of speaker, but in the middle of a speech, as Denniston shows, its force is something like 'but the rub is', moving from a side issue to the main point. That doesn't seem plausible here. To say 'We have captured him then to no purpose' is to make a central point, and it is the same point, not a different one, that is conveyed by 'What law prevents his being killed?' Instead of this sequence we need after 962 another line, probably beginning with ἄλλως, that restates the facts of the decision. It is to this that Alcmene's 962 would reply, the δὲ δή now conveying a touch of impatience, as at *El.* 237. Since we have a free hand here, we might as well introduce at an early stage the idea that Eurystheus is to be given back to the Argives, not merely spared. This is the idea Alcmene will twist, and it must be stated somewhere. I suggest <ἄλλως· ἀφεῖναι τοῖσιν Ἀργείοις χρεών.>

As for the lacunae on either side of 970, Zuntz quotes Elmsley to the effect that someone who is not punished can scarcely be said in normal parlance to be 'wronged'. That is one problem. There is also no clear meaning τὸ πρῶτον, which ought to contrast with some later injustice. The line makes better sense as ironic in the mouth of Alcmene, with a line missing before it. It is reasonable that the Servant, in reply to Alcmene's 'He ought not to be living and looking on the light', should say 'It is unjust to kill a man we once spared'. To this 970, now assigned to Alcmene, would be a fitting reply: 'The first injustice that was done him was his not being killed'. To this the Servant can reply, 'It would have been right for him to be killed then, I admit', paving the way for Alcmene's line 'Is it not therefore even now proper that he pay the penalty?' Notice that the οὖν of οὔκουν now makes sense. Here is the passage with my *exempli gratia* supplements:

Θε. οὐκ ἔστ' ἀνυστὸν τόνδε σοι κατακτανεῖν.
Αλ. ἄλλως ἄρ' αὐτὸν αἰχμάλωτον εἵλομεν.
⟨Θε. ἄλλως· ἀφεῖναι τοῖσιν Ἀργείοις χρεών.⟩
Αλ. εἴργει δὲ δὴ τίς τόνδε μὴ θνῄσκειν νόμος;
Θε. τοῖς τῆσδε χώρας προστάταισιν οὐ δοκεῖ.
Αλ. τί δὴ τόδ'; ἐχθροὺς τοισίδ' οὐ καλὸν κτανεῖν;

Θε. οὐχ ὅντιν' ἄν γε ζῶνθ' ἕλωσιν ἐν μάχῃ.
Αλ. καὶ ταῦτα δόξανθ' Ὕλλος ἐξηνέσχετο;
Θε. χρῆν αὐτόν, οἶμαι, τῇδ' ἀπιστῆσαι χθονί.
Αλ. χρῆν τόνδε μὴ ζῆν μηδ' ἔτ' εἰσορᾶν φάος.
⟨Θε. ἀλλ' ἄδικον ἄνδρ' ἀφέντας εἶτ' ἀποκτανεῖν.⟩
Αλ. τότ' ἠδικήθη πρῶτον οὐ θανὼν ὅδε.
⟨Θε. τότ' ἦν δίκαιον, οἶδα, τόνδε κατθανεῖν.⟩
Αλ. οὔκουν ἔτ' ἐστὶν ἐν καλῷ δοῦναι δίκην;

We must now turn to 1009-17, including the crux at 1015. I give Diggle's text but include more between the daggers than he.

νῦν οὖν ἐπειδή μ' οὐ διώλεσαν τότε
πρόθυμον ὄντα, τοῖσιν Ἑλλήνων νόμοις
οὐχ ἁγνός εἰμι τῷ κτανόντι κατθανών·
πόλις τ' ἀφῆκε σωφρονοῦσα, τὸν θεὸν
μεῖζον τίουσα τῆς ἐμῆς ἔχθρας πολύ.
προσεῖπας, ἀντήκουσας· ἐντεῦθεν †δὲ χρὴ
τὸν προστρόπαιον τόν τε γενναῖον καλεῖν†.
οὕτω γε μέντοι τἄμ' ἔχει· θανεῖν μὲν οὐ
χρῄζω, λιπὼν δ' ἂν οὐδὲν ἀχθοίμην βίον.

1014 προσεῖπας Elmsley: πρὸς ἃ (ἅ γ' L[c] vel Tr[1]) εἶπας L 1015 τὸν παλαμναῖον Kirchhoff

The passage shows very clearly one of the dangers that beset the critic trying to explicate a play he knows well, the tendency to read parts of the play in the light of what the reader knows is coming. It is apparent that this speech of Eurystheus has been read—at the point where there is a crux—as if it anticipated points destined to be made in his very last speech. We shall do much better to deal with the crux in the context of what has actually gone before.

Alcmene had denounced Eurystheus as the persecutor of Heracles, his children, and herself and had said that he ought to be put to death. After the interchange about the propriety of killing him ends with Alcmene's strong determination to do so, Eurystheus addresses himself to her. He begins by saying that he does not intend to plead for his life or do anything else cowardly. Then he sets out his version

of the events Alcmene had described. Hera had involved him in this quarrel, he says, and once he was in, he determined to leave no stone unturned. His own safety was at stake, for Heracles was a formidable opponent, and the hero's children would be his avengers if they grew to manhood. Anyone in my position, he says, you included, would have done the same.

The οὖν in 1009 is a bit difficult, but I think the sense is this: 'Since I have just demonstrated that I am not guilty of anything worthy of death, and since I was not killed on the field of battle in circumstances where killing is ὅσιον, by the usages of the Greeks my death would be a source of pollution to anyone who killed me. My release by the Athenians shows their σωφροσύνη, for they set a much higher value on the will of the god than on my being their enemy. [The god in this case is either the divine will in general or Zeus as the god primarily concerned with the shedding of blood.] You have spoken and have heard my reply. And from this point on, . . .' It is at this point that he becomes unintellgible.

Pearson translates 1014-5 'Henceforth you must invoke me as the Avenger and the Gracious One'. He capitalizes Avenger and Gracious One and thinks of these apparently as cult titles of the heroized Eurystheus. But this is just the wrong tack to take. Nothing has been said to this point in the play about Eurystheus' heroization, so the remark would be utterly unintelligible in the context supplied thus far. Furthermore, it is not Alcmene but the Athenians who will invoke Eurystheus as hero, but the speech is all addressed to Alcmene, who will not be among his beneficiaries. Wilkins, though differing in detail, takes the same line: 'So henceforth you must call me at once the murdered man who calls for vengeance and the noble-hearted hero' or (reading the demonstrative τόνδε for τόν τε) 'henceforth you must call me, the one whose blood calls for vengeance, the gracious one'. But why should Alcmene do any such thing? There has been nothing in the speech to mark a change of addressee, and Eurystheus is certainly not going to be a noble-hearted hero or 'the Gracious One' to her.

The text as it stands is clearly unsatisfactory, and no one thus far has produced a plausible emendation. Kirchhoff's τὸν παλαμναῖον apparently means that Alcmene is to call the suppliant (τὸν προστρόπαιον) the avenger of blood (τὸν παλαμναῖον), but even apart

from the fact that both direct object and predicate accusative are inconveniently supplied with articles, this makes no sense. Who is to do the calling, and why? What function does this statement about calling have in the context of a speech in which Eurystheus explains that he does not deserve to die but does not intend to beg for his life?

Let us examine context as the best clue to the poet's meaning. Note first that the last two lines of the speech are introduced by γε μέντοι and are about the verdict that Alcmene will render. Their sense is '*But* while I am not eager to die, I will not be vexed at leaving life'. Surely the previous sentence must have been about the choice Alcmene has to make, and the implications of the 'but' are that it presented letting him go as the better option. The sense must be 'You would do better not to kill me, *but* this is how things stand with me: while I am not eager to die, I will not be greatly vexed at dying', a return to the stance he took at the beginning of the speech, refusing to beg for mercy. The same tale is told by ἐντεῦθεν coming right after προσεῖπας, ἀνήκουσας: speeches have been spoken on both sides, and *from now on* it is time for you to decide.

We can get the required sense and at the same time save every single letter transmitted in 1015 except the tau of τε (which we must change to a delta) if we are willing to assume a lacuna. In view of Eurystheus' claim that it was respect for a god that kept the Athenians from killing him, one possible sense of τὸν προστρόπαιον τόνδε would be 'I who am under a god's protection'. One of the alternatives involves something happening to this man. The other involves calling someone noble. I give an *exempli gratia* supplement.

ἐντεῦθεν δὲ χρὴ
τὸν προστρόπαιον τόνδε ⟨δυσσεβῶς θανεῖν
ἢ σ' ἐκ φόνου σωθέντα⟩ γενναῖον καλεῖν.

'From this point on either I, who am under a god's protection, must be impiously put to death, or I must call you noble being rescued from murder.' There is no need to write γενναίαν as Euripides elsewhere uses γενναῖος as an adjective of two terminations at *Hec.* 592.

HIPPOLYTUS

66-71

καλλίστα πολὺ παρθένων,
ἃ μέγαν κατ' οὐρανὸν
ναίεις εὐπατέρειαν αὐ-
λάν, Ζηνὸς πολύχρυσον οἶκον.
χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ καλλίστα
καλλίστα τῶν κατ' Ὄλυμπον.

67 μεγάλαν Weil

On the virtues of Weil's μεγάλαν and also its shortcomings see W. Stockert, *Prometheus* 20 (1994), 212-3.

As regards 70-1, Willink has drawn my attention to the metrical problem here. Diggle's colometry involves period-end after 70: see Stinton, *CPGT* 325-7 (=*CQ* 27 [1977], 38-40). Period-end is unwelcome in the middle of anadiplosis, and we might prefer Barrett's colometry χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ καλλίστα καλ- / λίστα τῶν κατ' Ὄλυμπον. There is, however, a serious objection to this. Buijs has shown that 'dragged' aeolic lines (i. e. blunt lines ending long-long instead of the expected short-long) do not seem to exhibit word-end after the penultimate syllable.[1] Willink suggests χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ καλὰ καλ- / λίστα τῶν κατ' Ὄλυμπον, substituting an aristophanean for the dragged ¨gl. But ¨gl / ph is inherently attractive, and perhaps we should write χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ μάλιστα καλ- / λίστα τῶν κατ' Ὄλυμ-πον. For the doubling of the comparative or superlative idea by means of μᾶλλον or μάλιστα see 485, 1421, *Hec.* 377, 620 (conjectural), and *El.* 222.

99-104: See *CP* 75 (1980), 130-7.

139: See *Heroic Muse* 129, n. 34.

[1] See J. A. J. M. Buijs, *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985), 63-74.

239-41

δύστηνος ἐγώ, τί ποτ' εἰργασάμην;
ποῖ παρεπλάγχθην γνώμης ἀγαθῆς;
ἐμάνην, ἔπεσον δαίμονος ἄτῃ.

241 ἄτῃ] αἴσῃ Π^{3}

The phrase δαίμονος ἄτη is certainly plausible (cf. *El*. 1307 ἄτη πατέρων and perhaps *Pho*. 1066, where δαιμόνων could go either with ἁρπαγαῖσι or with ἄτῃ), but in view of the papyrus we must reconsider. *Andr*. 1203 gives us θεοῦ αἶσα, and West directs me to *Od*. 11.61, δαίμονος αἶσα, and *H. Dem*. 300, δαίμονος αἴσῃ. Corruption from αἴσῃ to ἄτῃ is aided by the fact that the madness Phaedra describes is often called ἄτη, whereas corruption in the reverse direction has no such easily discernible motive. 'I was mad, I fell, and it was the doing of some divinity' is quite good, and since the manuscript in which it occurs is nearly a millenium older than our next oldest witness to this portion of the text, and since the corruption is easy to explain, we should probably adopt the reading of the papyrus.

267-71

Χο. γύναι γεραιά, βασιλίδος πιστὴ τροφέ,
Φαίδρας ὁρῶμεν τάσδε δυστήνους τύχας,
ἄσημα δ' ἡμῖν ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ νόσος·
σοῦ δ' ἂν πυθέσθαι καὶ κλύειν βουλοίμεθ' ἄν.
Τρ. οὐκ οἶδ', ἐλέγχουσ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐννέπειν θέλει.

271 ἐλέγχουσ' Π^{3}BAVΛ et $^{l}Σ^{b}$ et $Σ^{mnv}$ et $^{i}Σ^{mnbv}$: ἐλέγχους O et $^{l}Σ^{n}$: ἐννέπουσα M

Barrett daggered ἐλέγχουσ' and wrote 'I can neither explain this nor emend it'. He cites two strong reasons why οὐκ οἶδ' ἐλέγχουσ' cannot be correct, to which Diggle thought it sufficient reply to insert a comma after οὐκ οἶδ'. Barrett also convincingly refutes the misconceived attempts of Nauck and Weil to emend the passage. Willink, *CQ* 62 (1968), 38-9, ventured οὐκ οἶδ'· ἐλεγχούσῃ γὰρ ἐννέπειν φθονεῖ, which is attractive but involves changing both the mid-

dle and the end of the line. I think it possible that οὐκ οἶδ' is an explanatory gloss, giving the gist of what the Nurse expressed in her roundabout way by saying, e. g., ἀπεῖπ' ἐλέγχουσ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐννέπειν θέλει. There are other ways of supplying the two required syllables, κέκμηκ' ἐλέγχουσ', ἀνῆκ' ἐλέγχουσ', κάμνω σφ' ἐλέγχουσ' (anticipated in part by Barthold's κάμνω γ' ἐλέγχουσ'), or even μεθῆκ' ἐλέγχους.

375-87: See *AJP* 101 (1980), 287-303.

664-8: See *GRBS* 29 (1988), 125.

669-79

τάλανες ὦ κακοτυχεῖς
γυναικῶν πότμοι·
τίν' ἢ νῦν τέχναν ἔχομεν ἢ λόγον
σφαλεῖσαι κάθαμμα λύειν λόγου;
ἐτύχομεν δίκας. ἰὼ γᾶ καὶ φῶς·
πᾷ ποτ' ἐξαλύξω τύχας;
πῶς δὲ πῆμα κρύψω, φίλαι;
τίς ἂν θεῶν ἀρωγὸς ἢ τίς ἂν βροτῶν
πάρεδρος ἢ ξυνεργὸς ἀδίκων ἔργων
φανείη; τὸ γὰρ παρ' ἡμῖν πάθος
πέραν δυσεκπέρατον ἔρχεται βίου.
κακοτυχεστάτα γυναικῶν ἐγώ.

669^{n} φα. A et in ras. B: χο. (et 672^{n} φα.) MOVELP: [D] 670 τίν' ἢ νῦν Page, Conomis (Hermes 92 [1964] 36): τίνα νῦν ἢ Λ et Σ^{nbv}: τίνα νῦν ΩV et B^{1c}L^{c} et ^{1}Σ^{bv}: τίνας νῦν <B$^{?}$> et B^{s} τέχνας <B$^{?}$> et B^{s} (~B^{1c}) λόγον <B$^{?}$>ΟΛ et B^{s}V^{3} et Σ^{nbv}: λόγους MAV et B^{1c}Tr 671 λύειν Musgrave: λύσιν ΟΛ et B^{2}V^{3} et ^{1}Σ^{n}: λύσειν ΩV et E^{s}Tr et ^{1}Σ^{v} λόγου BOAΛ et ^{i}Σ$^{nbv(1)}$ (τῶν ἐγκλημάτων): λόγους MV et ^{1}Σ^{v} et ^{i}Σ$^{nbv(2)}$: λόγων B^{1c}

At *Heroic Muse* 134, n. 80, I argued, following W. D. Smith, *TAPA* 91 (1960), 169-70 and S. Østerud, *GRBS* 11 (1970), 307-20, that these lines, which stand in six manuscripts divided between the Chorus (669-71) and Phaedra (662-9) and in two are given wholly to

Phaedra, belong in reality to neither but should be given to the Nurse. I have nothing to add to what Smith, Østerud, and I have already said except to reply to a hypothetical objection. It could be urged that the speaker of these lines regards herself, to judge from 673-4 and 677-9, as someone directly and strongly affected by this disaster, someone whose death is entailed in it, hence this speaker is unlikely to be the Nurse. It should be noted, however, that the Nurse speaks much the same way at 607.

Diggle's text of 670-1, printed above, is probably wrong. Diggle, like Barrett before him, ignores problems of idiom, style, and transmissional probability, all of which point to a solution proposed long ago by Barthold, *RhM* 31 (1876), 340.

Diggle's text may be translated 'What art do we [women] have, what speech, once we have slipped, to untie the knot speech has made?' This is clumsy for two reasons: first, because after naming two things, τέχνη and λόγος, that women lack, she says that these are needed to untie 'the knot λόγος has made' when it would be just as accurate to say 'the knot τέχνη has made'; second, the sentence at once denies τέχνη and λόγος to women (this is the force of the rhetorical question) and attributes to them enough λόγος to make a knot or noose (for κάθαμμα λόγου means a noose created by a woman's words). Further evidence against this text is provided by the scholiast, who says of κάθαμμα λύειν, 'ἐπὶ τῶν δύσλυτόν τι ἐπιχειρούντων λῦσαι', agreeing closely with Hesychius κ 84 (Latte), Suda κ 31 (Adler), and Zenobius, *Prov.* 4.46 (Leutsch-Schneidewin, *Paroemiographi Graeci* i.97-8) in making the two words a proverbial expression for solving a difficult problem.[1] The addition of a genitive λόγου to this expression is unwelcome.

The manuscripts make 670 and 671 each end in a form of λόγος, the first in either λόγους or λόγον, the second in either λόγους, λόγου, or λόγων. Diggle thinks both occurrences of λόγ- are genuine and writes λόγον . . . λόγου. Barrett writes λόγους . . . λόγου, with an unexplained shift from plural to singular. Neither is sufficiently suspicious of the habits of scribes, for when the same word occurs at the end of successive lines, times without number it is a mechanical error of a scribe. It does not take an unduly suspicious temperament

---

[1] The derivation of this proverb from the Gordian knot in Phrygia is presumably incorrect.

to suppose that the λόγ- of either 670 or 671 is a mechanical repetition.

Which of the two occurrences is genuine, and what form, what case and number of λόγος, did Euripides write? We have already seen that κάθαμμα λύειν λόγου creates difficulties of sense, and it is now apparent that the genitive is wholly unwanted. If we assumed that λόγους is correctly transmitted in one place or another (and it is the only reading common to both 670 and 671), it is easy to see how it could have been changed to the easier genitive singular or genitive plural in 671. The same is true of the variants λόγους and λόγον in 670, the singular being explicable as the influence of the majority reading τέχναν. The conclusion is that λόγους is genuine at one of the two places and an early error at the other. The plural is exactly what is needed to express the idea of speech as an expedient: see *Med.* 965, 1226, *Hip.* 688, 960, *Hec.* 250, etc. When you are in trouble, you reach for λόγοι, not λόγος. Diggle's λόγον in 670 looks thin and implausible.

Two other facts allow us to emend with virtual certainty. (1) Examination of the witnesses makes it quite clear that in 670 the paradosis is the singular τέχναν, and that the plural τέχνας is secondary. As far as meaning is concerned, there is no reason why Euripides could not have written τίνας νῦν τέχνας, as Barrett thought he did: 'What arts?' is no worse than 'What art?'. But the easy correction of the majority's τίνα νῦν τέχναν to τίνας νῦν τέχνας, accomplished by two suprascript sigmas in B, would be convincing only if we did not have Λ's τίνα νῦν ἢ τέχναν. As it is, we must suppose that the original reading was Page's τίν' ἢ νῦν τέχναν, that the slight hyperbaton was eliminated in one branch of the tradition by rearrangement and in another by omission, and that B's suprascript sigmas are conjectural and mistaken.

(2) Whenever Euripides has expressions of the type 'What benefit or what harm?' and the second word requires a different number of the interrogative pronoun from the first (as at *Pho.* 1335 τίν' εἴπω μῦθον ἢ τίνας γόους), he repeats the interrogative in the new form required, never allowing the first interrogative to do double duty. Here are the instances: *El.* 907-8 τίν' ἀρχὴν . . . ποίας τελευτάς, τίνα μέσον τάξω λόγον, 1303 τίς δ' ἔμ' Ἀπόλλων, ποῖοι χρησμοί, *Ion* 1294 ποίοισι πανοῖς ἢ πυρὸς ποίᾳ φλογί, *Pho.* 1335 (quoted

above), *Or.* 831-2 τίς νόσος ἢ τίνα δάκρυα καὶ τίς ἔλεος, 861 τίς ἀγών, τίνες ἐν Ἀργείοις λόγοι. Indeed, even where there is no difference of number but only one of gender requiring a different form of the interrogative, Euripides provides the second interrogative in the great majority of the cases: see *Andr.* 389-90 τίνα σῶν ἔκτανον παίδων ἐγώ; ποῖον δ' ἔπρησα δῶμα, *Hec.* 155 ποίαν ἀχώ, ποῖον ὀδυρμόν, *Su.* 990 τί φέγγος, τίν' αἴγλαν, *Tro.* 266-7 τίς... νόμος ἢ τί θέσμιον, *Ion* 1350 τί κέρδος ἢ τίνα βλάβην, *Hel.* 165 ποῖον ἀμιλλαθῶ γόον ἢ τίνα μοῦσαν ἐπέλθω, *Or.* 467-8 τίνα σκότον ... ποῖον ... νέφος.[1] I have found only one case that violates the rule that difference of number causes a repetition of the pronoun, *HF* 1271, a place where we also have a marked anacolouthon or zeugma:

ποίους ποτ' ἢ λέοντας ἢ τρισωμάτους
Τυφῶνας ἢ Γίγαντας ἢ τετρασκελῆ
κενταυροπληθῆ πόλεμον οὐκ ἐξήνυσα;

It follows, therefore, that in order to say 'What τέχνα do we have, or what λόγοι', Euripides will not use τίνα to cover both but will use τίνας for the second. The first λόγους must be replaced, as Barthold suggested:

τίν' ἢ νῦν τέχναν ἔχομεν ἢ τίνας
σφαλεῖσαι κάθαμμα λύειν λόγους;

'What craft do we have, what words, once we have faltered, that can undo the knot (i. e. get us out of difficulty)?'

Barrett criticizes the hyperbaton as putting an impossible emphasis on λόγους, but he could have set his mind at ease on this point by consulting W. Breitenbach, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Euripideischen Lyrik* (Stuttgart, 1934, rpt. Hildesheim, 1967), pp. 242-7.

---

[1] I have ignored instances, many more numerous, where a different case is required. Difference of gender is ignored in only two cases, *HF* 1283 ἐς ποῖον ἱερὸν ἢ πανήγυριν φίλων, and *Hel.* 316 ἐς ποῖον ἕρπεις μῦθον ἢ παραίνεσιν.

Euripides uses anaphora of the interrogative in many places where only a single form would have been required by the above rule (*Hip.* 571, *Su.* 605-6, 623, 1048, *El.* 130, 1198-9, *HF* 451, *Pho.* 1498-9, *Or.* 154, 333), though cases such as *Alc.* 212, *Med.* 359-60, *HF* 80, 1025-6, *IT* 895, and *Hel.* 1509-10 show that occasionally he makes use of a single interrogative. For anaphora of the interrogative, see Collard on *Su.* 606-7 and the literature cited by him.

Breitenbach's first example on p. 246 of 'Trennung durch mehrere Wörter' is a separation of interrogative adjective from its noun much more pronounced than the present instance, *IA* 1036-9. For separated interrogative following closely upon unseparated, see *Su.* 605-6 τίνα λόγον, τίν' ἂν τῶνδ' αἰτίαν λάβοιμι;

706-7

παῦσαι λέγουσα· καὶ τὰ πρὶν γὰρ οὐ καλῶς
παρῄνεσάς μοι κἀπεχείρησας κακά.

Phaedra is talking to the Nurse. In the text as transmitted in all the manuscripts, τὰ πρίν apparently goes with κακά, and the expression τὰ πρὶν κακά is the object of both παρῄνεσας and ἐπεχείρησας. This would be no problem if it were not for οὐ καλῶς. We are obliged to translate 'Enough talk! For you also recommended the former evil things dishonorably and took them in hand'. This means that with the first verb the idea of blame is conveyed twice, by κακά and by οὐ καλῶς. One would have thought, though, that οὐ καλῶς παρῄνεσας would by itself be enough to convey the idea of giving dishonorable advice. Read instead of τὰ πρίν, τὸ πρίν: 'Enough talk! The advice you gave me *before* was dishonorable, and what you attempted to do was wrong.' Precisely this corruption, for analogous reasons, is to be found at *Hip*. 785, where some of the manuscripts read τὰ, and *Alc*. 706, where they all do.

839-43

ἀπώλεσας γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ κατέφθισο.
†τίνος κλύω† πόθεν θανάσιμος τύχα,
γύναι, σὰν ἔβα, τάλαινα, κραδίαν;
εἴποι τις ἂν τὸ πραχθέν, ἢ μάτην ὄχλον
στέγει τύραννον δῶμα προσπόλων ἐμῶν;

841 κραδίαν Kirchhoff: καρδίαν codd., quo servato τάλαιν', ἔβα Elmsley

Elmsley's transposition in 841 is easy. The benefit it confers is to get rid of a split resolution of the third element of the dochmius. It is hard to see why Diggle did not adopt it.

Diggle gives no suggestion for the daggered words in 840, but the immediately following 842-3 suggest that Theseus wants to know from what source he is to learn the truth. If 840 gave adequate meter, we would simply translate 'From whom I am to hear whence this deadly fate came against your heart, unlucky wife?' This is immediately followed, in asyndeton, with 'Will someone tell me what has happened?' I thought of restoring the needed dochmius by writing κλύω τοῦ, the word-order being corrupted to the more normal interrogative one and the unusual pronoun replaced. But the most satisfying solution belongs to R. Enger, who at *Philologus* 12 (1857), 466 proposed τοῦ δὲ κλύω. The corruption is even simpler to explain (a suprascript τίνος was taken as the replacement for two words), and the connective eases the change to a new subject. (I owe this reference to W. Stockert, who in turn credits W. Kraus for drawing his attention to it.)

866-70

φεῦ φεῦ, τόδ' αὖ νεοχμὸν ἐκδοχαῖς
ἐπεισφρεῖ θεὸς κακόν· †ἐμοὶ [μὲν οὖν ἀβίοτος βίου]
τύχα πρὸς τὸ κρανθὲν εἴη τυχεῖν.†
ὀλομένους γάρ, οὐκέτ' ὄντας, λέγω,
φεῦ φεῦ, τῶν ἐμῶν τυράννων δόμους.

The bracketed words in 867 are a mechanical repetition of 821 that has presumably obliterated the original wording. We are thus on very uncertain ground here, for 868, though it scans plausibly as 2δ, does not have an obvious sense. No certainty is possible here, but intuition suggests (1) that εἴη is no optative of wish but should have an ἄν, and (2) that the sense is roughly 'I shall have (ἐμοὶ being genuine) a life that is wretched' (869-70 explains why: their royal house has been destroyed). A rhetorical question ('What life shall I have?') could express the force of 'wretched' (not easy to accommodate in any other way), and the whole could have read either ἐμοὶ βίος / τίς ἂν πρὸς τὸ κρανθὲν εἴη τυχεῖν or ἐμοὶ τίς ἄν / τύχα πρὸς τὸ κραν-

θὲν εἴη τυχεῖν: 'What life (or fate) will be mine to obtain?' The first, which I print in the apparatus of the Loeb, commends itself because βίος might have given rise to the mechanical repetition of ἀβίοτος βίου. The second, however, allows the needed ἄν to stand in the gap that *ex hypothesi* was caused by the mechanical repetition and to leave the next line untouched.

925-31

φεῦ, χρῆν βροτοῖσι τῶν φίλων τεκμήριον
σαφές τι κεῖσθαι καὶ διάγνωσιν φρενῶν,
ὅστις τ' ἀληθής ἐστιν ὅς τε μὴ φίλος,
δισσάς τε φωνὰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἔχειν,
τὴν μὲν δικαίαν τὴν δ' ὅπως ἐτύγχανεν,
ὡς ἡ φρονοῦσα τἄδικ' ἐξηλέγχετο
πρὸς τῆς δικαίας, κοὐκ ἂν ἠπατώμεθα.

As is well known, purpose clauses that depend upon unrealized possibilities or unfulfilled obligations take imperfect or aorist indicative: see Smyth § 2185c and K.-G. ii.389-90. The use of ἄν in such clauses is not well attested, and Kühner-Gerth's evident scepticism seems justified. Here in 931 we have an ἄν, and while we could make ἠπατώμεθα a main verb, the καί, seeming to connect it to ἐξηλέγχετο, appears to tell against this. We can make an independent clause more plausible by eliminating one letter and repunctuating: ὡς ἡ φρονοῦσα τἄδικ' ἐξηλέγχετο πρὸς τῆς δικαίας· οὐκ ἂν ἠπατώμεθα. The asyndeton is explicative: 'so that the voice that thinks unjust thoughts would be convicted of falsehood by the just voice: (thus) we should never be deceived'.

1012-5: See *GRBS* 23 (1982), 45-8.

1169-70

ὦ θεοί, Πόσειδόν θ'· ὡς ἄρ' ἦσθ' ἐμὸς πατὴρ
ὀρθῶς, ἀκούσας τῶν ἐμῶν κατευγμάτων.

'O gods and Poseidon! So after all you are truly my father since you heard my prayer!' Two things distress here. First, while it seems to be common to say 'Zeus and the gods' for 'Zeus and the other gods', I know of no instance where a divinity other than Zeus receives this kind of treatment. Second, it is odd that Theseus, having named a plurality of gods, should then use the second person singular. Barrett's parallel, *El.* 771 ὦ θεοί, δίκη τε πάνθ' ὁρῶσ', ἦλθές ποτε, at least ascribes to δίκη an action that would not be absurd predicated of the gods in general, whereas only one god can be Theseus' father. Perhaps read ὦ θεοί· Πόσειδον, ὡς ἄρ' ἦσθ' ἐμὸς πατὴρ ὀρθῶς, κτλ. For a vocative preceding exclamatory ὡς ἄρ' ἦσθα, see *Med.* 1280.

1301-3

τῆς γὰρ ἐχθίστης θεῶν
ἡμῖν ὅσαισι παρθένειος ἡδονὴ
δηχθεῖσα κέντροις παιδὸς ἠράσθη σέθεν.

Artemis, explaining to Theseus how it is that Hippolytus has met with destruction, says 'For she was stung by the goad of that goddess most hated by us who take pleasure in virginity and fell in love with your son'. It is, however, odd that those who hate Aphrodite and take pleasure in virginity are described as an exclusively female group since we know that this group contains Hippolytus. Weil suggested ὅσαις τε, which might allow for Hippolytus under the plural ἡμῖν. But if we find it difficult to take ἡμῖν as 'Hippolytus and I', we might read ὅσοισι. The masculine gender is generalizing but could have been taken by a scribe to refer to Artemis' own sex and altered accordingly.

1348-9

αἰαῖ αἰαῖ·
δύστηνος ἐγώ, πατρὸς ἐξ ἀδίκου
χρησμοῖς ἀδίκοις διελυμάνθην.

The meaning we expect is 'Wretched man that I am, I am shamefully treated by the unjust utterance *of* an unjust father'. Why then the preposition ἐξ, which adds nothing? For ἐξ perhaps read exclamatory ὡς. This will have been omitted by haplography after (πατρ)ὸς and the damage papered over.

1459-61

ὦ κλείν' Ἀφαίας Παλλάδος θ' ὁρισματα,
οἵου στερήσεσθ' ἀνδρός. ὦ τλήμων ἐγώ,
ὡς πολλά, Κύπρι, σῶν κακῶν μεμνήσομαι.

1459 Ἀφαίας Fitton: ἀθῆναι BAV: ἀθηνῶν ΟΛ et V^s: vide 1123

BAV have ὦ κλείν' Ἀθῆναι Παλλάδος θ' ὁρίσματα, and the rest of the tradition has Ἀθηνῶν for Ἀθῆναι. Neither reading is possible, but the reading of the rest of the tradition must be regarded as secondary to that of BAV, for corruption of Ἀθῆναι to Ἀθηνῶν can be explained as assimilation to the following genitive, while the reverse cannot be explained. What then is the origin of the impossible Ἀθῆναι? There is only one that I can see: it is a one-word paraphrase of the entire line, indicating to some inexperienced reader that 'O glorious territory of < > and Pallas' means the same thing as 'O Athens'. But it was taken to be a replacement for the word over which it was written, the word now represented by the blank.

What is the obliterated word? Barrett, who was not looking for something that could be paraphrased as 'O Athens', thought of restoring the name of a Trozenian deity, but could think of none. Fitton, *Pegasus* 8 (1967), 33-4 and Huxley, *GRBS* 12 (1971), 331-3 argue the claims of Aphaea, but as Sommerstein, *BICS* 35 (1988), 39-40, points out, she is a local Aeginetan divinity with no proven connection to Trozen. What is more, neither Euripides nor any other tragic poet so much as mentions her. Indeed, no poet mentions her at all. Her sole existence in Greek literature is in Pausanias' references to Aegina.

She may be safely dismissed, both here and at 1123, where Fitton also introduced her by conjecture. But that is all right since the search that led to her was moving in the wrong direction anyway.

The paraphrase Ἀθῆναι tells us that we need not look for anything Trozenian: the reference is to Athens, with tributary states such as Trozen being simply understood. We need the genitive of a proper name that will indicate, as Παλλάδος does, that the ὁρίσματα in question are Athens. There are only two that come to mind, Cecrops and Erechtheus. The claims of the second are marginally better. Euripides nowhere says 'land (or city) of Cecrops' for Athens using the genitive of the name, but for 'city and land of Erechtheus' see 1095, and for a similar expression see *Med.* 1384, γαῖαν . . . Ἐρεχθέως. The Erechtheum and the Parthenon stand next to one another on the Acropolis, and it would be completely natural for Theseus to join human and divine protectors in the apostrophe ὦ κλείν' Ἐρεχθέως Παλλάδος θ' ὁρίσματα. At several points, Athens displaces Trozen as the place of chief importance for the action: see 973-5 and 1092-5. Homer supplies parallels both for 'land or house of Erechtheus' as a periphrasis for Athens and for Erechtheus and Athena being closely associated: see *Il.* 2.546-9 and *Od.* 7.80-1. I find that I am anticipated in precisely this supplement by W. Stockert, *Prometheus* 20 (1994), 233.

26-8: See *Andromache* 9-20.

36-8: See *Andromache* 9-20.

51-3

ἔνθα Λοξίᾳ δίκην
δίδωσι μανίας, ᾗ ποτ' ἐς Πυθὼ μολὼν
ᾔτησε Φοῖβον πατρὸς οὗ κτείνει δίκην.

52 ᾗ Reiske: ἣν codd.

The accusative here is defensible not, as Stevens suggests, as an accusative of respect, but as an extended internal or cognate accusative going principally with ᾔτησε but also to a lesser degree with μολών: the madness consisted in the asking and also the going to Delphi. For a similar accusative, see 304-6, παρέλυσε δ' ἂν Ἑλλάδος ἀλγεινοὺς / †μόχθους οὓς ἀμφὶ Τροίαν† / δεκέτεις ἀλάληντο νέοι λόγχαις, which, though textually insecure, show that the 'toils' consist in the ten years' wandering. (Murray's conjecture, οὓς ἀμφὶ Τρωίαν πόνους, is good enough to be right.) Our passage is explained—and some further examples given—by Barrett on *Hip.* 752-7 (foot of p. 307).

56-60

δέσποιν', ἐγώ τοι τοὔνομ' οὐ φεύγω τόδε
καλεῖν σ', ἐπείπερ καὶ κατ' οἶκον ἠξίουν
τὸν σόν, τὸ Τροίας ἡνίκ' ᾠκοῦμεν πέδον,
εὔνους δ' ἐκεῖ σοι ζῶντί τ' ἦ τῷ σῷ πόσει,
καὶ νῦν φέρουσά σοι νέους ἥκω λόγους, κτλ.

59 δ' ἐκεῖ Badham: δὲ καὶ codd.: [Π[8]]: δ' ἀεί Hartung

Since all the words from ἐγὼ in 56 to πέδον in 58 explain why δέσποινα is an appropriate form of address to use, and since τοι seems not to be used for such explanations, we should consider Hartung's γὰρ for τοι. The words are more frequently confused than their unlikeness would lead one to expect. I cannot remember seeing τοι mistakenly transmitted for γάρ, but the opposite error is found at *Hec.* 228 and 606 and at *HF* 678. We should perhaps punctuate accordingly with parentheses or dashes before ἐγὼ and after πέδον.

In 59 δ' ἐκεῖ is Badham's conjecture for the manuscripts' δὲ καί, and Hartung proposed δ' ἀεί. But on the hypothesis that ἐγώ τοι (or γὰρ) . . . πέδον is an explanatory parenthesis, we do not want the connective. Perhaps just read ἐκεῖ or ἀεί.

147-54: See *Andromache* 99, n. 5.

192-204

εἴπ', ὦ νεᾶνι, τῷ σ' ἐχεγγύῳ λόγῳ
πεισθεῖσ' ἀπωθῶ γνησίων νυμφευμάτων;
ὡς ἡ Λάκαινα τῶν Φρυγῶν μείων πόλις
†τύχῃ θ' ὑπερθεῖ† κἄμ' ἐλευθέραν ὁρᾷς;
ἢ τῷ νέῳ τε καὶ σφριγῶντι σώματι
πόλεως τε μεγέθει καὶ φίλοις ἐπηρμένη
οἶκον κατασχεῖν τὸν σὸν ἀντὶ σοῦ θέλω;
πότερον ἵν' αὐτὴ παῖδας ἀντὶ σοῦ τέκω
δούλους ἐμαυτῇ τ' ἀθλίαν ἐφολκίδα;
ἢ τοὺς ἐμούς τις παῖδας ἐξανέξεται
Φθίας τυράννους ὄντας, ἢν σὺ μὴ τέκῃς;
φιλοῦσι γάρ μ' Ἕλληνες Ἕκτορός γ' ὕπερ;
αὐτή τ' ἀμαυρὰ κοὐ τύραννος ἦ Φρυγῶν;

203 γ' Jacobs: τ' codd. ὕπερ Dawe: ἄπο codd.

At *Andromache* 20-8 (=*HSCP* 81 [1977], 137-48), I recommended the deletion of 194-5 and the transposition of 199-200 to precede 196. The text as transmitted in the manuscripts is defended by G. Goebel, *CP* 84 (1989), 32-5. Although this defense is spirited, I wish to indicate here why in the end I am not convinced it has succeeded.

Goebel claims that Andromache's answer to the charge that she is trying to oust Hermione from her place as Neoptolemus' wife is in two parts, one relating principally to the impossibility of means (194-8), the other to inadequacy of motive (199-204). In this, he says, we see the 'a simple pattern of rhetorical argument that can be exactly paralleled from the *Palamedes* of Gorgias'. He admits that in both Gorgias and Euripides the two parts of the argument show some overlap, with considerations of impossibility being used to prove certain motives inadequate. But he maintains that, as the two sections of Palamedes' defense are distinct in form, if not always logically, so are those of Andromache's defense.

When we descend for a closer look, here is what we find. Palamedes introduces the two principal sections of his defense as follows: (§ 6) ἐπὶ τοῦτον δὲ τὸν λόγον εἶμι πρῶτον, ὡς ἀδύνατός εἰμι τοῦτο πράττειν and (§ 13) σκέψασθε κοινῇ καὶ τόδε· τίνος ἕνεκα προσῆκε βουληθῆναι ταῦτα πράττειν, εἰ μάλιστα πάντων ἐδυνάμην; What in Euripides corresponds to this clear articulation of the steps of the argument? At the beginning of 199, the transition point, according to Goebel, we have nothing to mark the passage from one argument to another, only asyndeton. This leaves the audience with the task of divining that this is a new section, a difficult task since, as Goebel admits, the line between the two kinds of arguments is not a sharp one. That the Athenian audience of ca. 425 would have been so familiar with this kind of argumentation as to make its explicit articulation unnecessary cannot be regarded as proved: we cannot be sure that Gorgias' *Palamedes* or other works like it were well known to a wide audience by this date. The parallel with Gorgias thus lacks the necessary explanatory force.

Difficulties are brushed under the rug. 'The form of the question [199-202] is irregular, and Kovacs makes much of this in impugning the transmitted text. It is true that the second limb of a question articulated by πότερον . . . ἤ *normally* advances a parallel alternative, but Andromache's reason for violating the expected symmetry is obvious' (p. 33, emphasis mine). One might expect from Goebel's 'normally' that he knew of one or two departures from the norm and was going to respond to my challenge, *Andromache* 22 (=*HSCP* 81 [1977], 140): 'Anyone who thinks that 199f. and 201f. pose a pair of alternatives, and that Euripides could have written them as they

stand, is invited to find—in Euripides or elsewhere—a similar pair'. My footnote lists all the instances of πότερον or πότερα in Euripides, yet Goebel cites no parallel from either Euripides or any other author. As for Andromache's reason for violating the expected symmetry, it is far from obvious. Andromache could have stated the alleged second motive and then refuted it with reference to her own circumstances: 'Is it in order to bear children in your place who are slaves and miserable dependents to myself? (Implied answer: obviously not.) Or did I perhaps aspire to become Neoptolemus' lawful wife and to put my children on the throne? Surely, though, I must have been aware that the Phthians would never accept the children of a captive woman as their kings.' Here the procedure would have paralleled *Hec.* 260-4, where, after an initial motive is treated as manifestly absurd, a second is explicitly stated before being explicitly refuted. It is thus not, as Goebel says, 'rhetorically imperative that the answer to her second question be as self-evident as the answer to her first'. Goebel implies that the passage could not reasonably have been otherwise, but the normal use of πότερον . . . ἤ and the normal Euripidean method of conducting an argument[1] have both been violated. While we might be forced to say resignedly 'That's just the way it is', we are a long way from Goebel's claim 'We could have expected nothing different'. There are real oddities here, and my transposition and excision, which I justified paleographically, set them to rights. To urge that all is well on the basis of a passage of unknown date from another genre—one of whose most salient features is an explicit articulation of the argument that is missing in Euripides—seems to me unhelpful.

Dindorf, keeping the τ' of the manuscripts in 203, posited a lacuna. This may be right, but we can avoid unnecessarily disfiguring our texts with angle brackets by accepting Jacobs' γ' for τ'. I do not think we need to adopt Dawe's further ὕπερ, which seems less suitable than the transmitted ἄπο. For the preposition in this sense, see LSJ s.v. III.6.

---

[1] See, in addition to *Hec.* 260-4, *Hip.* 1009-20, where, as here, the πότερον question is left unanswered as patently absurd, and the ἤ question explicitly states a motive which is then explicitly refuted.

220-5

αἰσχρόν γε· καίτοι χεῖρον' ἀρσένων νόσον
ταύτην νοσοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ προὔστημεν καλῶς.
ὦ φίλταθ' Ἕκτορ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν σὴν χάριν
σοὶ καὶ ξυνήρων, εἴ τί σε σφάλλοι Κύπρις,
καὶ μαστὸν ἤδη πολλάκις νόθοισι σοῖς
ἐπέσχον, ἵνα σοι μηδὲν ἐνδοίην πικρόν.

In 220 we should adopt the minority reading χεῖρον in preference to χείρον': an adverb is wanted, an adjective is not.

In 221 Stevens explains προὔστημεν as a gnomic aorist. But the discussion in K.-G. i.158-61 insists that in form such aorists express a generality in terms of something that happened once in the past, leaving the hearer to draw from it the necessary degree of generality. Here προὔστημεν καλῶς doesn't possess the single-event character for which an aorist would be the obvious tense to use. The evaluative word καλῶς also seems foreign to such gnomic expressions. Corruption has been suspected. Hermann proposed προσταῖμεν, but an optative would be worse sense than a subjunctive. We *could* read προστῶμεν, but it would be well to bear in mind the possibility that the corruption is deeper and that Euripides might have written something like προστῆναι καλόν.[1]

234-6

Ερ. τί σεμνομυθεῖς κἀς ἀγῶν' ἔρχῃ λόγων,
ὡς δὴ σὺ σώφρων, τἀμὰ δ' οὐχὶ σώφρονα;
Αν. οὔκουν ἐφ' οἷς γε νῦν καθέστηκας λόγοις.

An examination of all the uses of ὡς δή in Euripides reveals a problem here. It is usually construed with a participle (*Alc.* 537, 1014, *Andr.* 594, *Sup.* 477, *El.* 947, *IT* 682, *Ion* 654, *Hel.* 1038, 1057, *Pho.* 873), and contrary instances are rare. A participle seems to be understood at *Hec.* 1152, *HF* 1407, and *Ba.* 224. At *IT* 1025 it is used

[1] Valckenaer suggested a lacuna before 222, presumably because he was troubled by the ἀλλά in that line. But its meaning ('Why I even went so far as') and its position after an apostrophe are adequately defended by Denniston, *GP* 7 and 22-3.

with a finite verb, but Markland's deletion, adopted by Diggle, is persuasive. Besides our passage, only at *IT* 1184 is its use with a finite verb plausibly attested, and there it is ὡς plus optative in a purpose clause. Can we make this passage a bit more regular?

If we punctuate with a question-mark after σώφρων, we can easily understand οὖσα. The remainder of the line is then a separate sentence and need not be accommodated within the ὡς-clause. (We could connect the two halves with absolute clarity by writing τἄμ' ἄρ' οὐχὶ σώφρονα;) The pronoun σύ, however, is unnecessary: the repetition of the second-person idea in a participial phrase modifying a second-person understood subject would be hard to parallel. We could eliminate it by writing ὡς δὴ φρονοῦσα. The verb, with εὖ, is commonly used in Euripides for 'be sound of mind'. Much rarer is φρονεῖν *simpliciter* in this sense (I could find fewer than a dozen cases), and it might have attracted a gloss σωφρονοῦσα or σώφρων, which could well have been adapted to the meter to produce the reading of our manuscripts The same could have happened to ὡς δὴ φρενήρης (sc. οὖσα).

An incidental but substantial benefit of dividing 235 in two is that the second half of 235 provides a question to which 236 can reply: 'Am I not self-controlled?' 'Not, at any rate, to judge from the speeches on which you take your stand.' For οὔκουν . . . γε with this or analogous sense, see 444, *IT* 516, *Hel.* 1251, and *Or.* 1607.

240-2

Αν. οὐκ αὖ σιωπῇ Κύπριδος ἀλγήσεις πέρι;
Ερ. τί δ'; οὐ γυναιξὶ ταῦτα πρῶτα πανταχοῦ;
Αν. ναί,
καλῶς γε χρωμέναισιν· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ καλά.

It can be proven with nearly mathematical certainty that 242 was never intended as the reply to 241 and that, since both lines are transmitted exactly as they came from the pen of the author, there must have been other lines between them, now lost. There are two points that can be proven. (1) The first half of Andromache's line 242 gives the wrong answer to Hermione's question. (2) The second half gives

an elaboration that is irrelevant to 241 and relevant only to a quite different question.

(1) Andromache cannot be saying 'Yes (sex is of first importance to women everywhere), if they use it well' because the 'Yes' is false to her beliefs and to the contrast the play develops between the attitudes of its characters on this subject. Andromache does not think that sex is of first importance to good women. She believes that other things, such as harmony in the family, take precedence over her exacting what is due to her as a wife from her husband. She finds fault with Hermione's attitude precisely on this question, comparing it to her own complaisance in the amours of her husband. The wives of the Thracian king, she says, are many and must share his attentions in turn. A good woman puts up with this and does not kill all her rivals. Failure to acquiesce is a demonstration of ἀπληστία λέχους, sexual insatiability, which is a discredit to the entire sex. It is the Spartan characters who think sexual satisfaction is the chief end of life. Menelaus says as much in 370-3: λέχους στέρεσθαι is a serious matter, enough to make him enter the fray against a slave-woman.[1] It is not the best women, in Andromache's view, who make sex their all-in-all but the worst.

(2) The answer 'Yes, if they use it well: otherwise it is not good' is not the answer to the question 'Is not sex of first importance to women everywhere?' for the point at issue in the reply is not sex's importance but its goodness. The second half of the line can be represented logically 'If non-X, then non-Y'. The first half must mean 'If X, then Y'. Since non-Y='not good', it follows that Y='good', and that the full translation of 242 is 'Yes, (it is good) if they use it properly, but if they do not, it is not good'. Cf. the structure of 254, εἰ μὴ θανοῦμαί γ'· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ λείψω ποτέ.

The line that followed 241 (241a) gave the answer 'No'. And the line that preceded 242 (241b) was a question whether sex was good. The passage must originally have looked something like this:

Αν. οὐκ αὖ σιωπῇ Κύπριδος ἀλγήσεις πέρι;
Ερ. τί δ'; οὐ γυναιξὶ ταῦτα πρῶτα πανταχοῦ;

---

[1] In 372-3, his words are designedly ambiguous, for ἀνδρὸς ἁμαρτάνειν could mean both the more serious 'lose her husband (permanently)' and the less serious 'lose her husband's embraces (temporarily)'.

⟨Αν. οὔκ, ἤν γε μή τις μάργος οὖσα τυγχάνῃ. 241a
Ερ. τί δ'; οὐ τὰ Κύπριδος δῶρα σεμνὰ καὶ καλά;⟩ 241b
Αν. καλῶς γε χρωμένοισιν· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ καλά.

I have changed χρωμέναισιν to the generalizing masculine. After the loss of 241a and 241b, the participle would have been adjusted in gender to its new surroundings.

304-6: See above on 51-3.

319-63: See *Andromache* 29-36.

336-7

ἐν τοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς καὶ σὺ τόνδ' ἀγωνιῇ
φόνον· τὸ συνδρῶν γάρ σ' ἀναγκάσει χρέος.

For reasons I gave at *Andromache* 29-36, I bracket 330-51 as an interpolation. But the author, though betraying his hand in little ways, writes fairly graceful trimeters, and his work too deserves to have the accidental blemishes of the centuries removed. In the two lines above, Andromache tries to convince Menelaus that if Hermione secures her death, he too will share the blame. Remarkable is the phrase τὸ συνδρῶν . . . χρέος, which we would have to translate as 'the fact of complicity' (literally, 'the complicitous thing or obligation'). We could grit our teeth and do so, telling ourselves that we do not know what are the limits of Anonymous's style, but there is no need to acquiesce in the needless χρέος when the simplest of changes, a transposition of letters, produces much better sense: read τὸ συνδρῶν . . . χερός, 'the complicity of your hand'.

551-3

ἡγοῦ σὺ θᾶσσον, οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἔοικέ μοι
σχολῆς τόδ' ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἀνηβητηρίαν
ῥώμην με καὶ νῦν λαμβάνειν, εἴπερ ποτέ.

553 με καὶ νῦν Platt (CR 10 [1896] 382): μ' ἐπαινῶ MAV et ${}^{1}\Sigma^{v}$ et gB: ἐπαινῶ BOLP et ${}^{1}\Sigma^{my}$ et gV: cf. Sapph 1.5 et 25 LP, S. OT 164-7, Ar. Equ. 594

Neither ῥώμην μ' ἐπαινῶ λαμβάνειν nor ῥώμην ἐπαινῶ λαμβάνειν is plausible here in any sense that has been suggested, as Stevens' note makes clear. Diggle was right to reject it.

Diggle accepts Platt's emendation instead, apparently taking it as expressing a prayer: the examples he cites are of prayers of the form 'Grant, if you have ever granted before'. But that is difficult here as there was no *previous* occasion when the gods granted Peleus the recovery of his youth. Furthermore, as Stevens points out, the accusative and infinitive of prayer is unlikely here with no god being invoked and the sentence having begun in a purely declarative mode. Stevens prefers to take the accusative and infinitive as depending upon ἔργον, which seems quite possible. He goes on to say 'This suggestion also provides νῦν as a correlative to εἴπερ ποτέ, though this is not essential'. Here he puts his finger on a weak point: how plausible is καὶ νῦν, 'now *too*'? On what previous occasion was it the task of the moment for Peleus to recover his youth? It seems to me that there is nothing inevitable about Platt's suggestion, even construed as Stevens construes it, and that we would do better to adopt Paley's με καιρὸς as giving better sense and being nearly as close to the transmitted words: 'Lead me on more quickly, for this is not, I think, the task of a leisured moment: it is time now, if ever, to recover the strength of my youth.'

590-3

σὺ γὰρ μετ' ἀνδρῶν, ὦ κάκιστε κἀκ κακῶν;
σοὶ ποῦ μέτεστιν ὡς ἐν ἀνδράσιν λόγου;
ὅστις πρὸς ἀνδρὸς Φρυγὸς ἀπηλλάγης λέχους,
ἄκληστ' †ἄδουλα δώμαθ' ἑστίας† λιπών, κτλ.

591 v. del Herwerden 592 λέχους LP et gE: λέχος MBOAV

Since 590 and 591 say almost exactly the same thing ('What, do you belong with the men then, you utter coward?' 'How do you have any claim to esteem among men?'), Herwerden concluded reasona-

bly that only one of them was at home here. Euripides might have written them both but in different plays, and the second entered in the margin as a parallel noted down by some reader. Theoretically 590 could have been the intruder, but the lively γάρ anchors it so well in the present context that I prefer, with Herwerden, to delete 591.

The meaning we look for in 592 is 'seeing that you *were deprived* of your wife by a Phrygian, since you left your house unlocked'. Instead we are given 'got rid of' for 'were deprived', which is hard to construe with πρὸς ἀνδρὸς Φρυγός. Then too while the genitive λέχους construes with 'got rid of', the accusative λέχος, the better attested reading and also one difficult to account for as secondary, presupposes a *verbum privandi* that can be construed with a retained accusative. This points to ἀφῃρέθης λέχος. I confess I cannot explain the corruption of ἀφῃρέθης to ἀπηλλάγης.

Diggle daggers three words in 593, and I have followed him, although it is just possible, as Stevens urges, that the text is sound, with δώμαθ' ἑστίας to be taken as 'the *rooms* of his house', and ἄδουλα as 'unguarded'.

645-8: See *Andromache* 101, n. 26.

655-6: See *Andromache* 93, n. 58.

706-14: See *Andromache* 36-7.

925-30

εἰ δ' ἥξει πάρος
Φοίβου λιπὼν μαντεῖον ἐς δόμους πόσις,
κτενεῖ μ' ἐπ' αἰσχίστοισιν, ἢ δουλεύσομεν
νόθοισι λέκτροις ὧν ἐδέσποζον πρὸ τοῦ.
πῶς οὖν τάδ', ὡς εἴποι τις, ἐξημάρτανον;
κακῶν γυναικῶν εἴσοδοί μ' ἀπώλεσαν, κτλ.

929 Hermionae contin. Lenting: Orestae trib. codd. ἐξημάρτανον Vitelli: -τανες codd. et Σ^{hmbvny}

The manuscripts give 929 to Orestes as an interruption of Hermione's speech. But editors have followed Lenting in assigning it to Hermione, allowing no interruption. Stevens, arguing in favor of this change, says that attributions in manuscripts 'have no special authority'. This is a loose way of describing the facts. Speaker *names* possibly have no authority at all, since according to our best evidence the change of speaker in the earliest tragic texts was marked by a simple paragraphos. But it follows that *changes* of speaker do have authority, and adding or subtracting them is like adding or subtracting letters or words of dialogue: such changes must be argued for. Here two changes of speaker are transmitted. What are the grounds for removing or keeping them?

Though Stevens says nothing about it, the most important consideration against the manuscript assignment is that it is rare for two substantial speeches by the same speaker to be interrupted by a single line by his interlocutor. As we will see below, however, such a proceeding is not unique in Euripides.

An argument against reassigning the line to Hermione is that not only are two speaker changes transmitted, but the wording of 929 must be altered in order to reassign it. Vitelli's first-person verb is necessary if the line is to be given to Hermione. How are the two corruptions to be both explained? If the line were somehow incorrectly assigned, its wording could have been changed, but if 929 stood in the tradition as Vitelli wrote it, what would have motivated its reassignment? Likewise, if we assume that the corruption of its wording preceded, we could explain the reassignment. But how can the change of wording itself be explained?

Even when we adopt Vitelli's conjecture, the line still does not fit perfectly in Hermione's mouth. In Orestes' mouth, ὡς εἴποι τις tactfully refuses to call Hermione's conduct 'these grave missteps', assigning this description to unnamed others. In Hermione's mouth such a qualifying phrase would have no point as she has already said (920) that Neoptolemus will be justified in killing her and will go on to say (938-42) that her actions were complete folly.[1]

[1] Stevens, not satisfied with this, wants to interpret these words as a rhetorical anticipation of the objections of others, sees that with the transmitted text this will not work, toys with Nauck's ὧδ' ἐρεῖ τις for ὡς εἴποι τις, wisely rejects this as rewriting, and finally endorses Pflugk's impossible πῶς οὖν ἂν εἴποι τις τάδ' ἐξημάρτανον; I say impossible, because ἄν in that position would have to go with the main verb.

The upshot is that the evidence against giving the line to Hermione is so strong that even if the one-line interruption were a genuine *unicum* in tragedy, we should have to accept it with the best grace we could muster. As it is, however, we have similar one-line interruptions at *Tro.* 889 and *IT* 673 as well as more distant analogues at *Hec.* 238, *Or.* 476, and *Ba.* 663.

1005-8: See *Andromache* 37.

1009-18: See *AJP* 99 (1978), 422-5.

1027-36: See *Andromache* 38-41.

1037-46: See *Andromache* 41-3.

1097-9

ἀρχαῖσί τ' ἐπληροῦτο βουλευτήρια
ἰδίᾳ θ' ὅσοι θεοῦ χρημάτων ἐφέστασαν
φρουρὰν ἐτάξαντ' ἐν περιστύλοις δόμοις.

1097 ἀρχαῖσί τ' ἐπληροῦτο Diggle: ἀρχαί τ' ἐπληροῦντ' εἴς τε fere codd. τ'] δ' Blaydes

Diggle tried twice to emend this passage, *PCPS* 15 (1969), 43-4 (=his *Euripidea,* pp. 15-6) and *ICS* 6 (1981), 98 (=*Euripidea,* p. 215). Both involve deleting εἰς τε in the second half of the line, changing ἐπληροῦντ' to the singular, and the first word in the line to either ἀρχαῖά or the ἀρχαῖσί adopted in the text above. Thus three separate places in the line are changed. Does the result justify the cost?

The scansion ἐπ'ληροῦτο is rare but attested: see Denniston-Page on *Ag.* 536 and Diggle's 1981 discussion. If the sense were perfect, we should not hesitate to introduce such a scansion by conjecture. But 'were being filled up with magistrates' is dubious grammar. Verbs like πληρόω and πίμπλημι are sometimes construed with a dative, but K.-G. i.355 calls this an instrumental dative, which does not normally designate a person. It is probably significant that in the examples cited by Diggle and K.-G. what stands in the dative is a thing.

The only support I can find for such a dative of person is *Ba.* 18-9, μιγάσιν Ἕλλησι βαρβάροις θ' ὁμοῦ πλήρεις ἔχουσα καλλιπυργώτους πόλεις. The adjective πλήρης lends some support for a similar use of the verb πληρόω, but the parallel is not perfect since adjective and verb might not operate in precisely the same way. It must also be noted that deletion of 14-9 was proposed by three scholars in the nineteenth century and by two others in the twentieth.[1] Diggle's first attempt, ἀρχαῖα, is not open to this objection, but Diggle agrees with Stevens' objection that the adjective 'has no special point'.

The context, the reaction of the Delphian community to the threat of attack, might lead one to welcome a mention of 'the authorities' here (cf. *Ion* 1111, another crisis in Delphi), and we might expect that their actions would be described along with the actions of other persons not holding authority. That is precisely the picture we get in the passage as transmitted (with welcome parallelism between 1097 and 1098-9), provided we can rid ourselves of the unwanted τε before βουλευτήρια. Read τὰ βουλευτήρια with Reiske:

> ἀρχαὶ δ' ἐπληροῦντ' ἐς τὰ βουλευτήρια,
> ἰδίᾳ θ' ὅσοι θεοῦ χρημάτων ἐφέστασαν
> φρουρὰν ἐτάξαντ' ἐν περιστύλοις δόμοις.

Diggle rejects this by translating 'the magistrates filled themselves up into the council-chambers', but for precisely this use of πληρόομαι see *IT* 306, πολλοὶ δ' ἐπληρώθημεν οὐ μακρῷ χρόνῳ, 'many of us came streaming in', and Ar. *Eccl.* 89, and compare the similar usage of καλύπτω discussed by Bond on *HF* 640 f. I have also adopted Blaydes's δ' for τ'.

1129-34

> πυκνῇ δὲ νιφάδι πάντοθεν σποδούμενος
> προύτεινε τεύχη κἀφυλάσσετ' ἐμβολὰς
> ἐκεῖσε κἀκεῖσ' ἀσπίδ' ἐκτείνων χερί.
> ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἦνον, ἀλλὰ πόλλ' ὁμοῦ βέλη,

[1] See Diggle, *Euripidea*, p. 444 and n. 9.

οἰστοί, μεσάγκυλ' ἔκλυτοί τ' ἀμφώβολοι
σφαγῆς ἐχώρουν βουπόροι ποδῶν πάρος.

1132 ἦνον Borthwick (JHS 90 [1970] 15-17): ἦνεν M: ἤνυεν OAVLP: ἦμεν $V^{3\gamma\rho}$

The sequence of thought in 1132—the contrasts signaled by the two instances of ἀλλά—is not easy to grasp. Neoptolemus, though pelted by missiles in 1129-31, appears to be holding his own at this point. Why then say '*But* [his attackers] accomplished nothing, but all the weapons fell before his feet'? The first 'but' seems to imply a strong contrast with what precedes, whereas the attackers' failure to accomplish anything is perfectly consonant with the success of Neoptolemus' self-defense indicated in 1129-31. It is only at 1136 that Neoptolemus' self-defense begins to fail.

The ἀλλ' ought to mark a contrast, not between different aspects of Neoptolemus' self-defense, but between the success of that defense and the relentless attack, destined ultimately to succeed, by the Delphians. The thought will be as follows: 'Neoptolemus, though pelted by a thick snowfall of missiles, held his own well. But his attackers *did not let up*, but their missiles kept falling before his feet. He danced a pyrrhic dance in deadly earnest. And eventually, surrounded and worn down, he succumbed.' Read in 1132 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνῆκαν. For this form of the aorist, see *Ba.* 448.

1184-5

οὕτως ἂν ὡς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἐτιμᾶτ' ἄν, γέρον,
θανών, τὸ σὸν δ' ἦν ὧδ' ἂν εὐτυχέστερον.

1184 οὕτως Holzner: οὕτως τ' A: οὗτός τ' fere MOVL et $^{1}\Sigma^{mvny}$: [P] (μὲν οὖν κά- loco τ' ἂν ὡς ἐ- in ras.)

There seems to be a duplication of effort between οὕτως and ὡς ἐκ τῶνδ', both meaning 'under the circumstances just described, with Neoptolemus being killed at Troy'. In fact οὕτως looks like a peculiar error of A. The majority of manuscripts read οὗτος, which avoids the duplication. Furthermore all the manuscripts except the corrected P have τ', which likewise seems plausible: *both* Neoptolemus' *and*

Peleus' fate would be better. We should retain οὗτός τ' with the majority of the manuscripts and correct the δ' in 1185 to τ' with L. Dindorf.

1186-96

ὦ γάμος, ὦ γάμος, ὃς τάδε δώματα
καὶ πόλιν ὤλεσας ὤλεσας ἁμάν.
αἰαῖ, ἒ ἔ, ὦ παῖ·
†μήποτε σῶν λεχέων τὸ δυσώνυμον
ὤφελ' ἐμὸν γένος εἰς τέκνα καὶ δόμον ἀμφιβαλέσθαι
Ἑρμιόνας Ἀίδαν ἐπὶ σοί, τέκνον,† 1191
ἀλλὰ κεραυνῷ πρόσθεν ὀλέσθαι·
μηδ' ἐπὶ τοξοσύνᾳ φονίῳ πατρὸς
αἷμα τὸ διογενές ποτε Φοῖβον 1195
βροτὸς ἐς θεὸν ἀνάψαι.

The first thing to be noticed is that with the two second-person pronouns and adjectives (1189 and 1191) and the vocative ὦ παῖ, third-person ὤφελ' seems implausible. The meaning we expect is 'Would that *you* had never married Hermione but had perished by the lightning-bolt ere then!' If we intuit that ἐμὸν γένος is not the subject of the sentence, it must be made one of the objects of Neoptolemus' imprudent action. Next, since γένος, τέκνα, and δόμον all mean roughly the same thing, and there does not seem to be room for all three if we write ὤφελες, we might consider the possibility that one of them is secondary. A third problem is that ἀμφιβαλέσθαι seems to have two unconnected direct objects, σῶν λεχέων τὸ δυσώνυμον and Ἑρμιόνας Ἀίδαν. The verb also seems to have two expressions that act as the indirect object, εἰς τέκνα (?) καὶ δόμον and ἐπὶ σοί. Perhaps Peleus' wish in 1189-91 was in two parts, that his grandson had not on the one hand brought ignominy on Peleus' house and on the other a deadly marriage upon himself. For 'deadly' we have the common genitive Ἀίδα. The whole might have read

μήποτε σῶν λεχέων τὸ δυσώνυμον
ἐς γένος ἁμὸν καὶ δόμον ὤφελες ἀμφιβαλέσθαι
σοί τ' Ἀίδα γάμον Ἑρμιόνας, τέκνον,
ἀλλὰ κεραυνῷ πρόσθεν ὀλέσθαι.

'Would that you had not cast upon our family and house the ill-repute of this marriage and on yourself a union with Hermione that is death, my son, but had perished ere then by the lightning-bolt!'

HECUBA

52-4

γεραιᾷ δ' ἐκποδὼν χωρήσομαι
Ἑκάβῃ· περᾷ γὰρ ἤδ' ὑπὸ σκηνῆς πόδα
Ἀγαμέμνονος, φάντασμα δειμαίνουσ' ἐμόν.

Despite my discussion at *GRBS* 29 (1988), 125-6, in which I argued for deletion after Usener, I am now convinced by J. Gregory, *Phoenix* 46 (1992), 266-9, that the text is sound.

74-97: See *GRBS* 29 (1988), 127-8.

144-7: See *GRBS* 29 (1988), 128-9.

211-15

[καὶ σοῦ μέν, μᾶτερ, δυστάνου
κλαίω πανδύρτοις θρήνοις,
τὸν ἐμὸν δὲ βίον λώβαν λύμαν τ'
οὐ μετακλαίομαι, ἀλλὰ θανεῖν μοι
ξυντυχία κρείσσων ἐκύρησεν.]

211-15 del. Wilamowitz 211 σοῦ Heimsoeth e Σ^{m}: σὲ codd. 215 numeri abnormes

Wilamowitz[1] deleted these lines, partly because of metrical anomalies and partly on the ground that the point they make anticipates Polyxena's willing self-sacrifice in the next scene. But there is a close metrical similarity between these lines, standing at the end of the antistrophe, and 170-4, which stand at the end of the strophe. In particular, both start with an entirely spondaic anapestic dimeter and an entirely spondaic paroemiac. This suggests that we may have responsion and 211-5 may be genuine.

[1] See *Hermes* 44 (1909), 449-50 (=*KS* iv.228).

Diggle's ministrations at 170-4 produce anapests ending in a paroemiac. He suggests either ἔξελθ' ἔξελθ' οἴκων, ματρὸς / δυστανοτάτας ἄι' αὐδάν or δυστανοτάτας ματέρος, ἔξελθ' / ἔξελθ' οἴκων, ἄι' αὐδάν, getting rid of one of the two occurrences of ματέρος. But I do not find it jarring but perfectly natural to say, 'O child of a luckless mother, come forth from the tent, hear your mother's voice', and hence prefer to save all of what is transmitted and produce plausible meter by Dale's insertion of ⟨σᾶς⟩, which makes a good paroemiac:

ὦ τλάμων ἄγησαί μοι πούς,
ἄγησαι τᾷ γηραιᾷ
πρὸς τάνδ' αὐλάν. ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ
δυστανοτάτας ματέρος, ἔξελθ',
ἔξελθ' οἴκων,
ἄιε ⟨σᾶς⟩ ματέρος αὐδάν.

To mend the meter of the antistrophe, Dale proposed marking a lacuna of one monometer before the final paroemiac and also replacing ξυντυχία, which gives an unwanted full dimeter (and one that lacks a proper caesura) with Nauck's δαίμων. This is highly plausible metrically, and something to explain the comparative κρείσσων, such as ⟨τοῦ φέγγος ὁρᾶν⟩, would be welcome. Only one problem remains. There is nothing to connect τὸν ἐμὸν δὲ βίον with λώβαν the way λώβαν and λύμαν are connected. Also the trio is a bit odd: 'my life, and its maltreatment and outrage'. The sense we expect is 'I weep for you, but as for the maltreatment and outrage of *my* life, I do not lament it'. The passage may be plausibly restored:

καὶ σοῦ μέν, μᾶτερ, δυστάνου
κλαίω πανδύρτοις θρήνοις,
τοὐμοῦ δὲ βίου λώβαν λύμαν τ'
οὐ μέγα κλαίομαι, ἀλλὰ θανεῖν μοι
⟨τοῦ φέγγος ὁρᾶν⟩
πότμος κρείσσων ἐκύρησεν.

I thought τοὐμοῦ δὲ βίου was my own, but now I discover it was anticipated by Reiske. In 214 the manuscripts' μετακλαίομαι, with its overtones of regret for one's own actions, is not particularly apt, and

I have adopted Willink's μέγα κλαίομαι. I have preferred Weil's πότμος to Nauck's δαίμων on grounds of euphony.

227-8

γίγνωσκε δ' ἀλκὴν καὶ παρουσίαν κακῶν
τῶν σῶν. σοφόν τοι κἀν κακοῖς ἃ δεῖ φρονεῖν.

Heberden's school edition says, 'recognize (the feebleness of) your strength'. The parenthesis does little to inspire confidence. We do not say 'note the barking of the dog' when we mean 'note the absence of barking', nor do we say 'recognize your strength' when we mean 'recognize your weakness'. What do we expect Odysseus to say?

When someone is being told to go along quietly and put up no resistance, as at *Andr.* 130-2, the word ἀνάγκη is frequently used to designate the irresistible force to which he should yield. Hence for our passage Herwerden proposed γίγνωσκ' ἀνάγκην. The asyndeton is of a quite normal explicatory kind, but the propensity of scribes to put in a δ' where none is wanted may have contributed to the corruption.

258-70

ἀτὰρ τί δὴ σόφισμα τοῦθ' ἡγούμενοι
ἐς τήνδε παῖδα ψῆφον ὥρισαν φόνου;
πότερα τὸ χρή σφ' ἐπήγαγ' ἀνθρωποσφαγεῖν
πρὸς τύμβον, ἔνθα βουθυτεῖν μᾶλλον πρέπει;
ἢ τοὺς κτανόντας ἀνταποκτεῖναι θέλων
ἐς τήνδ' Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐνδίκως τείνει φόνον;
ἀλλ' οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ἥδε γ' εἴργασται κακόν.
Ἑλένην νιν αἰτεῖν χρῆν τάφῳ προσφάγματα·
κείνη γὰρ ὤλεσέν νιν ἐς Τροίαν τ' ἄγει.
εἰ δ' αἰχμαλώτων χρή τιν' ἔκκριτον θανεῖν
κάλλει θ' ὑπερφέρουσαν, οὐχ ἡμῶν τόδε·
ἡ Τυνδαρὶς γὰρ εἶδος ἐκπρεπεστάτη,
ἀδικοῦσά θ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἧσσον ηὑρέθη.

I discussed this passage in *GRBS* 29 (1988), 129-31, naming three reasons for deleting 265-6. (1) The couplet repeats the argument of 270. Herwerden proposed deleting 269-70, C. Busche 270 alone, and West 267-70. But these lines are good Euripidean Greek. By contrast 265-6 are (2) in asyndeton, though they make a new point and do not exemplify any of the uses to which asyndeton is usually put; and (3) are flaccid and undistinguished writing. If we are to eliminate the doubling by deletion, the earlier lines, being the weaker writing, are the stronger candidate.

Collard takes issue, claiming that my objections are of less moment than the lack of transition between 264 and 267 that results from the deletion. But surely δέ supplies all the transition Hecuba requires when she passes from her Point Two to her Point Three. Her argument may be summarized as follows: (a) Does fate or heaven demand a human sacrifice? The implied answer is clearly no: this is not a case like the death of Macaria or Menoeceus where a god requires a human victim. (b) Does Achilles demand Polyxena's death because she injured him? She never did so. (c) Then must the choicest and most beautiful of the captives be killed? That distinction belongs to Helen, who also is more guilty than the Trojans of injuring him. The three points show Euripides' usual *variatio*. The first two are a pair of questions introduced by πότερον and ἤ. The third is a statement introduced by δέ, followed by its justification, introduced by γάρ. For a similar *variatio* see *Hip.* 1009-20.

272-83

τῷ μὲν δικαίῳ τόνδ' ἁμιλλῶμαι λόγον·
ἃ δ' ἀντιδοῦναι δεῖ σ' ἀπαιτούσης ἐμοῦ
ἄκουσον. ἥψω τῆς ἐμῆς, ὡς φῄς, χερὸς
καὶ τῆσδε γραίας προσπίτνων παρηΐδος·
ἀνθάπτομαί σου τῶνδε τῶν αὐτῶν ἐγὼ
χάριν τ' ἀπαιτῶ τὴν τόθ' ἱκετεύω τέ σε,
μή μου τὸ τέκνον ἐκ χερῶν ἀποσπάσῃς
μηδὲ κτάνητε· τῶν τεθνηκότων ἅλις.
ταύτῃ γέγηθα κἀπιλήθομαι κακῶν.
ἥδ' ἀντὶ πολλῶν ἐστί μοι παραψυχή,
πόλις, τιθήνη, βάκτρον, ἡγεμὼν ὁδοῦ.

οὐ τοὺς κρατοῦντας χρὴ κρατεῖν ἃ μὴ χρεὼν
οὐδ' εὐτυχοῦντας εὖ δοκεῖν πράξειν ἀεί·

279 del. Hartung cl. Or. 66

Hartung drew attention to the repetition here of *Or.* 66, which is clearly genuine there. Such repetition is frequently due to borrowing by actors from other roles they have played. Is that the case here?

It is not merely the repetition that disturbs but the irrelevance of 279-81. Hecuba explicitly bases her claim on the fact that she granted Odysseus' request when she had him in her power. He asked for his life, and now she asks him for the life of her daughter. Then, attached to her request not to kill Polyxena, she adds 'Enough people have been killed already'. The next three lines, which describe what Polyxena means to Hecuba, are quite a different tack. They would be tolerable if they said that Polyxena's life meant as much to her as her own and was thus the proper return for Odysseus to make for being spared himself. But they do not make this point. Hecuba returns in 282 to a line of reasoning having nothing to do with who Polyxena is and everything to do with the exposed nature of human life. People in power ought not to exercise their power wrongfully or expect that they will be prosperous forever. This connects well with τῶν τεθνηκότων ἅλις but not at all with her explanation of what her daughter means to her. The asyndeton can be explained only if we remove 279-81, and so I delete them. Whether 280-1 were written by an actor for this place or borrowed from another play is unclear. The combination of βάκτρον and ἡγεμὼν ὁδοῦ, however, would fit well into the mouth of an Oedipus speaking of one or the other of his daughters.

293: See *Heroic Muse* 140, n. 24.

409-12

ἀλλ', ὦ φίλη μοι μῆτερ, ἡδίστην χέρα
δὸς καὶ παρειὰν προσβαλεῖν παρηίδι·
ὡς οὔποτ' αὖθις ἀλλὰ νῦν πανύστατον
ἀκτῖνα κύκλον θ' ἡλίου προσόψομαι.

412 om. MO (~$M^{1c}O^{1c}$), del. Wecklein: cf. Alc. 207-8.

Lines missing from part of the tradition are frequently spurious, and Wecklein's deletion of 412 is attractive on grounds of sense. While a possible reason for Hecuba to embrace Polyxena is that Polyxena is now looking on the 'ray and orb of the sun' for the last time and will never do so again, a stronger reason is that Hecuba will be embracing her daughter for the last time and never again. I cannot find a precise parallel for ὡς οὔποτ' αὖθις (sc. παρειὰν παρηίδι προσβαλεῖν μέλλουσα) but a partial parallel is furnished by passages such as *Hcld.* 672 ὡς ἐς ἔργον (sc. ἐλευσόμενος) ὥπλισται στρατός and *Pho.* 1363. I think that both here and at *Alc.* 207-8 the second line is likely to be secondary.

438-43

> οἲ 'γώ, προλείπω· λύεται δέ μου μέλη.
> ὦ θύγατερ, ἅψαι μητρός, ἔκτεινον χέρα,
> δός, μὴ λίπῃς μ' ἄπαιδ'. ἀπωλόμην, φίλαι.
> [ὡς τὴν Λάκαιναν σύγγονον Διοσκόροιν
> Ἑλένην ἴδοιμι· διὰ καλῶν γὰρ ὀμμάτων
> αἴσχιστα Τροίαν εἷλε τὴν εὐδαίμονα.]

Diggle adopts Dindorf's deletion of 441-3, as above. But the case, as Page noted in *Actors' Interpolations*, p. 67, is very weak. Collard, summing up for the prosecution, makes three points. (1) Hecuba faints at 440, and this is marked by ἀπωλόμην. She therefore cannot utter further lines. (2) '[F]or her to curse Helen is here false to the play (her 265ff are a rhetorical argument).' (3) 'ὡς for οὕτως . . . is a contextually incongruous Epicism.' But (1) it is not certain that Hecuba does faint. Certainly οἲ 'γώ, προλείπω· λύεται δέ μου μέλη mean that she is feeling faint. But ἀπωλόμην is not a clear indication that the threatened swoon has become a reality. It looks much more like a comment on her life than one on the present state of her health. Against the idea that she actually falls over in a swoon are two important pieces of evidence. First, the Chorus could not have failed to react if she collapsed in front of their eyes (cf. *Andr.* 1076-7, where Peleus totters and the Chorus show proper concern), and to have such

a swoon followed by αὔρα, ποντιὰς αὔρα would be not only unparalleled but also more than a little ridiculous. Second, when Talthybius arrives in the next scene, he finds Hecuba wrapped in her garments, which could not happen as an automatic result of her falling down but must have been done deliberately. The close parallel of *Hcld.* 602-4 would suggest that Hecuba's fainting symptoms are temporary and that she consciously and deliberately lies on the ground and covers her head, her actions mirroring her statement that for her life is at an end. In any case, we cannot conclude from ἀπωλόμην that Hecuba could not have spoken any further lines. Collard's first argument has, as far as I can see, no force whatever.

I confess that I do not understand what force Collard's (2) has. Can Hecuba be shown to take an attitude toward Helen elsewhere in the play that is incompatible with 441-3? The answer is a clear no. Hecuba's only other comments on Helen are the ones Collard tries to dismiss as rhetorical argument (as if this proved they were not her genuine sentiments). He cites utterances by the Chorus cursing Helen and Paris in this play and lines by Andromache at *Tro.* 772-3, but the relevance of these passages is hard to see. They prove that in Euripides it is dramatically possible for Trojan women in their hour of tragedy to curse Helen or Paris. I do not see how they prove that Hecuba could not have spoken 441-3. As far as I can see, there is no argument here at all.

As for (3), demonstrative ὥς is attested in Euripidean trimeters at *Hec.* 888, *Tro.* 726, *IT* 603, and *Ba.* 1068 (Barnes, for ὡς), and in lyric at *El.* 155. It is therefore Euripidean but rare. As Page says, it is not likely that an interpolator would have ventured it. Again, Collard's argument proves nothing.

The only argument that seems to possess any weight—and one that convinced me for years that these lines were spurious—is that it seems out of place for Hecuba to turn her mind from the grief at hand and curse someone who is such a remote cause of her misery. But Weil, who states this objection, answers it by saying that such faults are not rare in Euripides. The lines are there in the manuscripts, they are in Euripides' manner (cf. *Tro.* 772-3), and while they might not accord with modern taste, this is no reason to delete.

Such a conclusion would be a trifle gloomy, mere acquiescence in Euripides' faults of style without the consolation of any gain. But we

can go further, I think, and see why something like these lines is wanted here. We positively need something, I suggest, after ἀπωλόμην, φίλαι, for the episode must end on a different note. Hecuba's speech is followed by a choral ode beginning αὔρα, ποντιὰς αὔρα, evoking all the places in Greece to which they might be taken. We need something to suggest a relaxation of the tension of Polyxena's departure before such an escape ode makes emotional sense. Lines 438-440a continue the struggle against her daughter's fate that Hecuba has been carrying on since the beginning of the scene. With ἀπωλόμην, φίλαι, however, she announces that her life—and hence her struggle—is over. The curse against Helen does two things: it continues the theme of the end of her life by wishing a similar fate on Helen. And her impossible wish brings distance from the struggle just past and provides the proper emotional transition to the choral ode about Greece.

534-41

ὁ δ' εἶπεν· Ὦ παῖ Πηλέως, πατὴρ δ' ἐμός,
δέξαι χοάς μοι τάσδε κηλητηρίους,
νεκρῶν ἀγωγούς· ἐλθὲ δ', ὡς πίῃς μέλαν
κόρης ἀκραιφνὲς αἷμ' ὅ σοι δωρούμεθα
στρατός τε κἀγώ· πρευμενὴς δ' ἡμῖν γενοῦ
λῦσαί τε πρύμνας καὶ χαλινωτήρια
νεῶν δὸς ἡμῖν †πρευμενοῦς† τ' ἀπ' Ἰλίου
νόστου τυχόντας πάντας ἐς πάτραν μολεῖν.

At *Heroic Muse* 145, n. 58, I pointed out that although scholars seem to be agreed that the Greeks were stranded on the Thracian Chersonese because of adverse winds or no winds, thus making the return journey a mirror image of Aulis, there is in fact no warrant in the text for this supposition and quite a bit against it. Winds are mentioned in the play at line 900, and there Agamemnon says that he can grant Hecuba's request because the Greeks do not have favorable winds. He does not say 'do not *yet* have', and the windlessness seems to be a new situation. That would seem to be the most obvious reading of 444ff., for the Chorus sing 'Where will the breeze take me?' and assume that the breeze is blowing: this is not a wind-summoning

chorus like *IT* 1487ff. or *Hel.* 1495ff. Likewise in the prologue and the parodos, when Achilles appears above his tomb, he shouts to the Greeks who are sailing away. The parodos describes the ships as having their sails bellied out to their forestays (cf. 112 and my note in the Loeb *ad loc.*), and it seems the most reasonable reading of this description to say that it was Achilles' shout to the Greeks and his reproaches of ingratitude that halt the Greeks, not any lack of a following wind in their sails. The same story is told by the debate in the assembly. Some of the Greeks do not think that human blood should be shed in order to accede to Achilles' request, but there would, I think, have been no debate at all if this was the only means they had of getting home. (Compare what happens at Aulis, where the blood of Agamemnon's daughter is required, and no one except Agamemnon seems to think it is too high a price to pay.) It is precisely because the request is one that they can refuse to grant that a debate is possible at all. Then there is Hecuba's rhetorical question at 260-1: 'Has fate forced the Greeks to sacrifice a human being at a tomb, where the sacrifice of an ox is more fitting?' If the Greeks were being forced by adverse winds to make this sacrifice, Hecuba could hardly speak as she does. Finally, I can think of no parallel for a hero controlling the weather. One of the firm conclusions that emerges from the study of heroes as a phenomenon in the history of religions is that the sphere of influence of a hero is strictly local.[1] Weather conditions, one might suppose, are beyond his local competence.

This is a point of considerable importance to the interpretation of the play, so I naturally take some interest in a passage which might be supposed to contradict it. This is the prayer of Neoptolemus. What is he praying for? A good journey home and thus, by implication, favorable winds? Unfortunately the text is corrupt at a crucial point, for πρευμενοῦς, 'soft of temper, gentle of mood, kind, friendly', is not a plausible adjective to modify νόστου, and the source of it in the text is quite obvious, πρευμενής from two lines above.

In order to show what is needed, I give a translation, replacing the obliterated word by an X: 'And he said, "Son of Peleus, my father, receive these libations that charm the spirit and summon the dead up from below. Come and drink the blood of a maiden, black and un-

[1] See W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, tr. J. Raffan (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), p. 206.

diluted, which is the army's gift and mine. Be propitious to us, grant us your leave to cast off the mooring cables from our sterns, and, by getting a homeward journey that is X, all to get safely home.'"

For X Heimsoeth suggested εὐμαροῦς, 'easy'. But is it in Achilles' power, as a hero with only local influence, to give them an easy journey home? Neoptolemus, to be sure, may be praying for more than Achilles can give him, but it is hard to see why Euripides should make him do so, and I think we need a different word. The main thing that affected the Greeks on the first occasion was the words of reproach Achilles uttered. As Odysseus pointed out to Hecuba, this undermines Greek morale by showing that those who bravely give their lives to the cause are forgotten when they are dead. But surely there is another reason the Greeks might have felt hesitation. To start a long and perilous sea-journey with words of reproach ringing in your ears is an exceedingly dangerous thing to do. Achilles' influence in general may be only local, but like anyone else he can put the kibosh on an enterprise by uttering words of bad omen at a crucial time. What Neoptolemus must be praying for is that Achilles will allow the Greeks to cast off their cables and by getting a homecoming that is *well-omened* make their way safely home. We might replace πρευμενοῦς with αἰσίου, but the jingle αἰσίου τ' ἀπ' Ἰλίου νόστου may cause annoyance to some ears. Alternatives are ἡσύχου, i. e. without railery, and ἀφθόνου, without ill-will.

585-92

ὦ θύγατερ, οὐκ οἶδ' εἰς ὅτι βλέψω κακῶν,
πολλῶν παρόντων· ἢν γὰρ ἅψωμαί τινος,
τόδ' οὐκ ἐᾷ με, παρακαλεῖ δ' ἐκεῖθεν αὖ
λύπη τις ἄλλη διάδοχος κακῶν κακοῖς.
καὶ νῦν τὸ μὲν σὸν ὥστε μὴ στένειν πάθος
οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην ἐξαλείψασθαι φρενός·
τὸ δ' αὖ λίαν παρεῖλες ἀγγελθεῖσά μοι
γενναῖος.

I discussed this passage at *GRBS* 29 (1988), 131-3, but I am now convinced that the tack I took was mistaken. The chief problem was and is τόδ': it makes no sense to say 'If I seize on one misfortune,

this misfortune doesn't allow me' or 'doesn't let me go'. The solution I proposed was transposing 587 to follow 588. This, however, creates other problems, and it seems simplest to replace τόδ' with τάδ': 'If I seize on one misfortune, these others do not allow me to, and some other misfortune . . . calls me away from it again'.

671-3

ἀτὰρ τί νεκρὸν τόνδε μοι Πολυξένης
ἥκεις κομίζουσ', ἧς ἀπηγγέλθη τάφος
πάντων Ἀχαιῶν διὰ χερὸς σπουδὴν ἔχειν;

I discussed this passage at *GRBS* 29 (1988), 133-4, but I now believe that the text is probably sound. J. Gregory *per litteras* draws my attention to Mastronarde on *Pho*. 773 and H. Weil, *Sept tragédies d' Euripide* on *Hec*. 352.

788-801: See *Heroic Muse* 100-1 and 144, n. 53.

805: See *Heroic Muse* 144, n. 52.

814-27

τί δῆτα θνητοὶ τἄλλα μὲν μαθήματα
μοχθοῦμεν ὡς χρὴ πάντα καὶ ματεύομεν,
πειθὼ δὲ τὴν τύραννον ἀνθρώποις μόνην
οὐδέν τι μᾶλλον ἐς τέλος σπουδάζομεν
μισθοὺς διδόντες μανθάνειν, ἵν' ἦν ποτε
πείθειν ἅ τις βούλοιτο τυγχάνειν θ' ἅμα;
τί οὖν ἔτ' ἄν τις ἐλπίσαι πράξειν καλῶς;
οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὄντες παῖδες οὐκέτ' εἰσί μοι,
αὐτὴ δ' ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς αἰχμάλωτος οἴχομαι,
καπνὸν δὲ πόλεως τόνδ' ὑπερθρῴσκονθ' ὁρῶ.
καὶ μὴν (ἴσως μὲν τοῦ λόγου ξένον τόδε,
Κύπριν προβάλλειν, ἀλλ' ὅμως εἰρήσεται)
πρὸς σοῖσι πλευροῖς παῖς ἐμὴ κοιμίζεται
ἡ φοιβάς, κτλ.

824 ξένον Nauck: κενὸν codd.

Hecuba complains that mortals spend their time learning all other subjects but do not take further pains and pay necessary fees to learn the art of persuasion. Why, then, she asks, should anyone think that he will fare well in future? The question has in view the generality of mankind, who want success but do not take the necessary steps to get it. It does not ask why Hecuba herself should think she will ever fare well. Both οὖν and τις tell against the latter interpretation. Yet the next three lines imply that 820 had Hecuba's particular circumstances in view, for they detail all the reasons Hecuba has for thinking that her misery is permanent. Since 820 coheres with what precedes and 821-3 cohere neither with what precedes nor with what follows, the best course is to delete 821-3. They look like an actor's attempt to expand his part with a few pathetic lines, perhaps taken from some other play of Euripides. Herwerden had proposed deleting 820-3, but 820 is blameless and should stay.

In 824 Hecuba begins practicing the rhetorical art she complains is so neglected and appeals to Agamemnon's attachment to Cassandra. But she had better do the thing properly and not destroy her own case. Diggle's text, adopting Nauck's ξένον, gives the meaning 'although it is perhaps irrelevant to my argument to put forward the claims of Aphrodite, nevertheless I shall put them forward'. But Hecuba has no reason to make this damaging concession, and transmitted κενὸν makes a less damaging one: 'though perhaps this part of my speech will be for naught, appealing to Aphrodite, still I shall make the point'.

846-9: See *Heroic Muse* 145, n. 56.

859: See *Heroic Muse* 145, n. 57.

962-7

σὺ δ', εἴ τι μέμφῃ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀπουσίας,
σχές· τυγχάνω γὰρ ἐν μέσοις Θρῄκης ὅροις
ἀπών, ὅτ' ἦλθες δεῦρ'· ἐπεὶ δ' ἀφικόμην,
ἤδη πόδ' ἔξω δωμάτων αἴροντί μοι

ἐς ταὐτὸν ἥδε συμπίτνει δμωὶς σέθεν,
λέγουσα μύθους, ὧν κλυὼν ἀφικόμην.

Polymestor's self-excuse here has one needless confusion in it. He claims that the reason he hasn't come to see Hecuba earlier is that he was in the interior of Thrace when she arrived at the coast. As soon as he returned, he says, he was setting out again when he was met by the slave-woman. When he heard her story he came to see Hecuba. Where was he setting out for? Surely any other destination than the coast and Hecuba would be a total irrelevance. But then he knows of her arrival before the slave-woman comes. Why then does he say that he came *after hearing her story*?

This problem was noticed, as far as I can tell, only by a certain Faust, presumably Philipp Adolf Faust, 'Studien zu Euripides', *Progr. des Realprogymn. Altkirch*, 1881, which I have not seen. He seems to have suggested that the slave-woman met him as he was on his way *into* his house, and he proposed reading εἴσω in 965. Thus the slave-woman brings him real news. But αἴρειν πόδα and similar expressions are used of departures (e. g. *Hel.* 1627, *Tro.* 342), and I cannot find any instance where it describes an arrival or a stepping over the threshold on the way into a house.

The implication of 963-4 is that, had he been at home, Polymestor would have known of Hecuba's arrival in Thrace. This is also implied by the fact that he sets out again immediately upon arriving home: he must have known from his own sources that Hecuba was in Thrace. 'As I was on my way out the door to see you, this slave-woman here met me.' That is all his excuse needs: Hecuba's summons, he says, was unnecessary because he is a decent man who looks after his friends as soon as he hears they are in trouble. All that remains to be done is to delete 967, which is at variance with the picture painted by the preceding lines. M. L. West, *per litteras*, indicates that he would prefer to delete 965 if anything is to be done at all. But 967 wears the look of something jerry-rigged. The purpose of its manufacture was not at all discreditable, the desire to make what is slightly elliptical (Polymestor's story ending with the arrival of the servant-girl) perfectly plain to the meanest intelligence.

1013: See above on *Hcld.* 81.

1179

> ὡς δὲ μὴ μακροὺς τείνω λόγους,
> εἴ τις γυναῖκας τῶν πρὶν εἴρηκεν κακῶς
> ἢ νῦν λέγων ἔστιν τις ἢ μέλλει λέγειν,
> ἅπαντα ταῦτα συντεμὼν ἐγὼ φράσω·

In 1179 the periphrastic νῦν λέγων ἔστιν τις for νῦν λέγει τις is suspicious. See A. C. Moorehouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1982), p. 204, who notes that periphrasis of εἶναι with present participle 'suits portrayal of a situation rather than of an event'. Wecklein voiced his suspicions of the line, and I have deleted it.

1199-1203

> ἀλλ', ὦ κάκιστε, πρῶτον οὔποτ' ἂν φίλον
> τὸ βάρβαρον γένοιτ' ἂν Ἕλλησιν γένος
> οὐδ' ἂν δύναιτο. τίνα δὲ καὶ σπεύδων χάριν
> πρόθυμος ἦσθα; πότερα κηδεύσων τινὰ
> ἢ συγγενὴς ὤν, ἢ τίν' αἰτίαν ἔχων;

The usual construction of κηδεύω, 'become a κηδεστής of, marry into the family of', is with the dative. See J. Diggle, *Euripides: Phaethon* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 155 on line 241. Diggle says that here κηδεύω + acc. means 'make one a κηδεστής, marriage relation', but as this is the only instance that exists, there is room for doubt. There is no need here for an unusual meaning, and hence the construction too might be made regular by writing τινὶ for τινά. There is a similar corruption at *Med.* 94, where Blomfield's τινι is clearly correct.

163-7

ἀλλ', ὦ καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ἀλκιμώτατον κάρα,
ἄναξ Ἀθηνῶν, ἐν μὲν αἰσχύναις ἔχω
πίτνων πρὸς οὖδας γόνυ σὸν ἀμπίσχειν χερί,
πολιὸς ἀνὴρ τύραννος εὐδαίμων πάρος·
ὅμως δ' ἀνάγκη συμφοραῖς εἴκειν ἐμαῖς.

Dindorf proposed deleting 166. Deletion is attractive on several grounds. First, while it is not impossible that the line adds further reasons for the shame Adrastus feels at the prospect of falling on the ground and embracing Theseus' knees, 165 by itself is sufficient, and 166 feels like an afterthought and weakens the vigor of the sentence. Second and more important is the question how old a man Adrastus is in the play. Nowhere else is it firmly stated or clearly implied that Adrastus is white-haired or old. The closest we get to such evidence is 190-1, where Adrastus says of Athens νεανίαν / ἔχει σε ποιμέν' ἐσθλόν, which *might* be taken to imply that, since Athens' leader is young, Argos' leader must be regarded as old. I discuss this passage below and show that there is a good chance Markland's νεανιῶν is the truth. But even if we leave the passage as it stands, the statement that Athens has a vigorous, young general does not necessarily imply that Adrastus himself is old. For the point is not that Argos cannot do what is needed but that Athens can.

There is also evidence in the text that Adrastus is to be regarded as (comparatively) young. At 250-1 the Chorus, protesting against Theseus' refusal to help, say

ἥμαρτεν· ἐν νέοισι δ' ἀνθρώπων τόδε
ἔνεστι· συγγνώμην δὲ τῷδ' ἔχειν χρεών.

If Adrastus is not in some sense a young man, the fact that to err is characteristic of the young is irrelevant. It is true that Elmsley wrote ἥμαρτον, 'they erred', presumably referring to the Seven, but τῷδ' in the next line implies that it is Adrastus whose conduct ought to be

excused on the grounds of youth. Adrastus cannot, of course, be very young since he has daughters old enough to be married, but while it would be wrong to make him a youth, we need not therefore make him a grey-beard. We should delete 166.

173-83

πρεσβεύματ' οὐ Δήμητρος ἐς μυστήρια
ἀλλ' ὡς νεκροὺς θάψωσιν, ἃς αὐτὰς ἐχρῆν
κείνων ταφείσας χερσὶν ὡραίων τυχεῖν.
σοφὸν δὲ πενίαν τ' εἰσορᾶν τὸν ὄλβιον
πένητά τ' ἐς τοὺς πλουσίους ἀποβλέπειν
ζηλοῦνθ', ἵν' αὐτὸν χρημάτων ἔρως ἔχῃ,
τά τ' οἰκτρὰ τοὺς μὴ δυστυχεῖς δεδορκέναι
⟨ ⟩
τόν θ' ὑμνοποιὸν αὐτὸς ἂν τίκτῃ μέλη
χαίροντα τίκτειν· ἢν δὲ μὴ πάσχῃ τόδε,
οὔτοι δύναιτ' ἂν οἴκοθέν γ' ἀτώμενος
τέρπειν ἂν ἄλλους· οὐδὲ γὰρ δίκην ἔχει.

177-8 del. Bothe 179 δεδορκέναι Tyrwhitt: δεδοικέναι L post h. v. lac. indic. Matthiae

Bothe proposed deletion of 177-8. They are wholly irrelevant and interrupt the clear progress of the argument. The argument is that those in prosperity ought to have regard for the less fortunate: 'it is a wise thing for the rich man to look on the poor man and for those who are not unfortunate to turn their gaze to what is pitiable'. This is the role Theseus is being asked to play. By contrast, the poor man turning his gaze on the rich in envy 'so that desire for money may seize him' contributes nothing at all. Adrastus' situation is not one that calls for emulation of the wealthy.

We must also place a lacuna, as Diggle does, before 180. The alternative is to delete 180-3, but the presence of those lines here is difficult to account for if they are not genuine: they are not parallel to anything elsewhere in the passage. As to the contents of the lacuna, Johansen's guess that we have a *comparatio paratactica* expressing by means of τε . . . τε a comparison between effective eloquence and

effective poetry seems attractive. But it will have to be longer than the single line Diggle marks. For illustrative purposes we may write

⟨ἀλλ' οὐ δέδοικα τἀμὰ δυστυχήματα
μή μ' οὐκ ἐάσῃ τῷδε πρὸς χάριν λέγειν
πείθειν θ' ἃ χρῄζω; τόν τε γὰρ πειστήριον
εἶναι θέλοντα φαιδρόνουν εἶναι χρεών,⟩
τόν θ' ὑμνοποιὸν αὐτὸς ἂν τίκτῃ μέλη
χαίροντα τίκτειν· ἢν δὲ μὴ πάσχῃ τόδε,
οὔτοι δύναιτ' ἂν οἴκοθέν γ' ἀτώμενος
τέρπειν ἂν ἄλλους· οὐδὲ γὰρ δίκην ἔχει.

‘<Yet am I not afraid that the ruin of my fortunes will prevent me from pleasing this man by my speech and gaining what I want? For the speaker who wants to be persuasive must be cheerful,> just as the poet must compose in joy the songs he composes. For if those are not his circumstances, he cannot give pleasure to others: that is not how things work.’

190-2

τά τ' οἰκτρὰ γὰρ δέδορκε καὶ νεανίαν
ἔχει σε ποιμέν' ἐσθλόν· οὗ χρείᾳ πόλεις
πολλαὶ διώλοντ', ἐνδεεῖς στρατηλάτου.

In 190 Markland proposed νεανιῶν. This is likely to be right for two reasons. First, as transmitted 190-191a say that Athens has in Theseus ‘a good young shepherd’. The metaphor is familiar from expressions like ποιμένα λαῶν, but in Euripides shepherds in this extended sense take a genitive to specify their metaphorical flock: cf. 674 ποιμένες ὄχων and *Pho.* 1140 ποιμέσι λόχων.[1] Even more telling, 191b-192 make the point that what undoes cities is the lack of a general *tout court*, with nothing said or implied about his age. And why should Adrastus say—or anyone think—that youth in a general

[1] Sophocles at *Aj.* 360 appears to use bare ποιμήν in an extended sense, but the expression is obscure and Reiske's πημονὰν, cited by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, is a great improvement. Aeschylus' metaphorical language is less restrained, and at *Ag.* 657 we have ships ἄφαντοι ποιμένος κακοῦ στρόβῳ, i.e. scattered by a wind. At A. fr. 132c Radt simple ποιμήν appears to mean ‘king’.

is likely to make him better? Elsewhere in this play (160, 250-1), youth is the predisposing condition for folly.

216-20

ἀλλ' ἡ φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ μεῖζον σθένειν
ζητεῖ, τὸ γαῦρον δ' ἐν φρεσὶν κεκτημένοι
δοκοῦμεν εἶναι δαιμόνων σοφώτεροι.
ἧς καὶ σὺ φαίνῃ δεκάδος, οὐ σοφὸς γεγώς,
ὅστις κόρας μὲν θεσφάτοις Φοίβου ζυγεὶς κτλ.

Line 219 as transmitted says 'You appear to belong (or clearly belong) to this band since you are not wise, seeing that you gave your daughters, etc.'. The band in question is that of people who are foolish and think themselves wiser than the gods. As 219 is transmitted in L, Theseus says that Adrastus belongs to this band *because* he is foolish, and then specifies *why* he thinks he is foolish by means of a causal relative clause. But how much neater and more vigorous it is to construe γεγώς directly with φαίνῃ, remove the comma after δεκάδος, and adopt Markland's σοφῆς: ἧς καὶ σὺ φαίνῃ δεκάδος οὐ σοφῆς γεγώς, ὅστις κτλ., 'Clearly it is to this foolish band that you also belong seeing that, etc.'

220-46

ὅστις κόρας μὲν θεσφάτοις Φοίβου ζυγεὶς
ξένοισιν ὧδ' ἔδωκας ὡς δόντων θεῶν,
λαμπρὸν δὲ θολερῷ δῶμα συμμείξας τὸ σὸν
ἥλκωσας οἴκους· χρὴ γὰρ οὔτε σώματα
ἄδικα δικαίοις τὸν σοφὸν συμμειγνύναι
εὐδαιμονοῦντας τ' ἐς δόμους κτᾶσθαι φίλους.
κοινὰς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰς τύχας ἡγούμενος
τοῖς τοῦ νοσοῦντος πήμασιν διώλεσεν
τὸν οὐ νοσοῦντα κοὐδὲν ἠδικηκότα.
ἐς δὲ στρατείαν πάντας Ἀργείους ἄγων,
μάντεων λεγόντων θέσφατ' εἶτ' ἀτιμάσας,
βίᾳ παρελθὼν θεοὺς ἀπώλεσας πόλιν,
νέοις παραχθεὶς οἵτινες τιμώμενοι

χαίρουσι πολέμους τ' αὐξάνουσ' ἄνευ δίκης,
φθείροντες ἀστούς, ὁ μὲν ὅπως στρατηλατῇ,
ὁ δ' ὡς ὑβρίζῃ δύναμιν ἐς χεῖρας λαβών,
ἄλλος δὲ κέρδους οὕνεκ', οὐκ ἀποσκοπῶν
τὸ πλῆθος εἴ τι βλάπτεται πάσχον τάδε.
τρεῖς γὰρ πολιτῶν μερίδες· οἱ μὲν ὄλβιοι
ἀνωφελεῖς τε πλειόνων τ' ἐρῶσ' ἀεί·
οἱ δ' οὐκ ἔχοντες καὶ σπανίζοντες βίου
δεινοί, νέμοντες τῷ φθόνῳ πλέον μέρος,
ἐς τούς ⟨τ'⟩ ἔχοντας κέντρ' ἀφιᾶσιν κακά,
γλώσσαις πονηρῶν προστατῶν φηλούμενοι·
τριῶν δὲ μοιρῶν ἡ 'ν μέσῳ σῴζει πόλεις,
κόσμον φυλάσσουσ' ὅντιν' ἂν τάξῃ πόλις.
κἄπειτ' ἐγώ σοι σύμμαχος γενήσομαι;

221 δόντων Scaliger: ζώντων L 223 χρῆ Hartung: χρῆν L 230 del. Wilamowitz

At *GRBS* 23 (1982), 34-5, I argued for the deletion of 238-45. But there are subtle signs that even more of the passage is spurious or intrusive from another play and that we should delete 222-8 (Lueders) and 232-45 (suspectos hab. Wecklein), as well as 230 (Wilamowitz).

As to the first of these deletions, the evidence for Adrastus' folly, in Theseus' eyes, consists of two actions of his. The first is not foolish in itself but serves as a foil to the second. (See my discussion of this figure of thought in *CQ* 33 [1983], 336-7.) On the one hand, Adrastus gave his daughters in marriage to foreigners under compulsion of Phoebus' oracles in the belief that the gods had bestowed them thus, and he showed prudence in so doing. On the other hand, when it came to making an expedition, he ignored the warnings of divine displeasure and brought his city to ruin. Lines 222-8 interrupt this clear progression of thought, and because they interrupt it, they destroy the force of the μέν in 220 and make the marrying of his daughters to foreigners on the advice of Apollo itself a foolish act, which in Theseus' view (cf. 211-3) it ought not to be. The lines in question are also at least in part irrelevant to the situation being described here. It is true that no man in exile could be called εὐδαίμων, and to that extent 225 fits as a disparagement of Tydeus and

Polynices as sons-in-law. But at this stage Polynices has not yet done anything ἄδικον, and σώματα ἄδικα in 223-4 simply misdescribes him. Furthermore, up until now Theseus expressed the view that Adrastus' mistake was in ignoring the divine will (155-9, 216-8). Here his mistake is befriending those who are in trouble. This is an ignoble point of view to put in the mouth of Theseus, even at this stage of the action before his mother's intervention.

What is the origin of these lines? If someone understood 220-1 not as a foil to Adrastus' disregard of divine warnings against the expedition but as a foolish act in themselves, he may have felt that further explanation was necessary. He would have a motive to insert whatever arguments he could think of, even if, as we have seen, they were not very good.

As for the much larger deletion of 232-45, the important point established by 220-1 and 229-31 is that Adrastus acted in a foolish way. Theseus ends by asking 'After what I have just described, shall I make an alliance with *you*? (We should perhaps write ἐγὼ σοὶ instead of ἐγώ σοι, in 246.) This makes sense as a reaction to Adrastus' folly in obeying the gods' will in some cases but trampling it under foot in others. Everything in between, however, weakens the effect of this because it consists of a long explanation of Adrastus' action where none is needed and (more important) none wanted. For if Adrastus was simply misled by young men, the criminal folly of his behavior is diminished, and Theseus' refusal to have anything to do with him is made less justifiable.

It should also be noted that Argos in the play is not elsewhere represented as an unstable democracy (cf. 1189-90). It is one thing to say that Adrastus was stunned by the din of young men's shouting (160), another to describe at length the ambitions of young men to be general and enjoy power and the instability of the upper and lower classes. The defense could be made that Euripides here makes an extra-dramatic allusion to the politics of his own city, but an interpolating actor could have done the same. I have shown that several interpolations in Euripides contain political reflection of just this kind. In the *GRBS* article cited above I mention some linguistic evidence in 238-45 that suggest a later date. We cannot catch the interpolator red-handed in 232-7, but the whole passage should perhaps stand or fall together.

Wilamowitz' deletion of 230 is also attractive. With 230 we have a heavy and participle-laden sentence, and εἶτα contrasts a participle in the nominative with a preceding genitive absolute. The passage is perfectly clear without it, yet someone might have felt that the implications of παρελθὼν θεοὺς—that the will of the gods had been announced—needed to be spelled out. For the reader's convenience I give the passage as I think Euripides wrote it:

ἀλλ' ἡ φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ μεῖζον σθένειν
ζητεῖ, τὸ γαῦρον δ' ἐν φρεσὶν κεκτημένοι
δοκοῦμεν εἶναι δαιμόνων σοφώτεροι.
ἧς καὶ σὺ φαίνῃ δεκάδος οὐ σοφῆς γεγώς,
ὅστις κόρας μὲν θεσφάτοις Φοίβου ζυγεὶς
ξένοισιν ὧδ' ἔδωκας ὡς δόντων θεῶν,
ἐς δὲ στρατείαν πάντας 'Αργείους ἄγων
βίᾳ παρελθὼν θεοὺς ἀπώλεσας πόλιν.
κἄπειτ' ἐγὼ σοὶ σύμμαχος γενήσομαι;

258-64

ἄγ', ὦ γεραιαί, στείχετε, γλαυκὴν χλόην
αὐτοῦ λιποῦσαι φυλλάδος καταστεφῆ,
θεούς τε καὶ γῆν τήν τε πυρφόρον θεὰν
Δήμητρα θέμεναι μάρτυρ' ἡλίου τε φῶς
ὡς οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἤρκεσαν λιταὶ θεῶν.
〈Χο. 〉
ὃς Πέλοπος ἦν παῖς, Πελοπίας δ' ἡμεῖς χθονὸς
ταὐτὸν πατρῷον αἷμα σοὶ κεκτήμεθα.

262 post h.v. lac. indic. Melanchthon-Xylander chori notam add. Musgrave

Since there is no connection between 262 and 263, it has been obvious since the Renaissance that it is the editor's duty to mark a lacuna. In that lacuna there might have been a change of speaker, as Musgrave thought, but according to L the boundary between Adrastus' speech and that of the Chorus is at 271, where the meter changes from iambic trimeters to lyric dactyls. Musgrave's speaker change

means giving the Chorus-leader an extensive spoken passage followed without break by a sung passage. This is anomalous (only A. *Eu.* 244-75 is a parallel), and it is worthwhile seeing whether we can preserve L's attributions. There is nothing in 263-70 that compels us to assign them to a female speaker. They fit perfectly well in Adrastus' mouth if we merely make the reasonable assumption that the hopelessness he expresses in 258-62 about the success of their supplication is not his final position. Adrastus might have thought of one further argument and expressed himself like this:

Δήμητρα θέμεναι μάρτυρ' ἡλίου τε φῶς
ὡς οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἤρκεσαν λιταὶ θεῶν.
⟨καίτοι τί πάσχω; χεῖρα σὴν ἱκνούμενος
ἀπεῖπον, ἓν μέγιστον ἐκλιπὼν ἔπος;
ἡ γὰρ τεκοῦσά σ' ἐστὶ Πιτθέως κόρη,⟩
ὃς Πέλοπος ἦν παῖς, Πελοπίας δ' ἡμεῖς χθονὸς
ταὐτὸν πατρῷον αἷμα σοὶ κεκτήμεθα.

The Chorus then leave Aethra and the altar of Demeter and Persephone and group themselves in supplication before Theseus, marking their stage movement by singing in dactylic rhythm.

297-300

οὔτοι σιωπῶσ' εἶτα μέμψομαί ποτε
τὴν νῦν σιωπὴν ὡς ἐσιγήθη κακῶς,
οὐδ' ὡς ἀχρεῖον τὰς γυναῖκας εὖ λέγειν
δείσασ' ἀφήσω τῷ φόβῳ τοὐμὸν καλόν.

What is the construction of τὰς γυναῖκας εὖ λέγειν in 300? The accusative could be subject ('in the belief that it is useless for a woman to be a good speaker') or object ('in the belief that it is useless to praise a woman'). Collard construes it as subject, but the relevance of the idea is hard to see. Aethra thinks she has good advice to give (εὖ λέγειν in another sense, which by definition is not useless), and nothing compels her to be an orator in any objectionable sense in order to do so. Also none of Collard's parallels find fault with eloquence in a woman (as opposed to being an orator at all). Further

hesitation is caused by the fact that while there are no exact parallels for deprecating eloquence in women (γυναῖκας as subject), there is a good one for deprecating the praise of women (γυναῖκας as object), Pericles' famous remark (Thuc. 2.45.2) that the greatest glory for a woman is not to be spoken of either for good or for ill among men.

To add still more to suspicion, we have two expressions for fear in 300 when even one is hard to explain. The first would have more work to do if a fear clause preceded it. We should mark a lacuna after 299, e. g.

> οὔτοι σιωπῶσ' εἶτα μέμψομαί ποτε
> τὴν νῦν σιωπὴν ὡς ἐσιγήθη κακῶς,
> οὐδ', ὡς ἀχρεῖον τὰς γυναῖκας εὖ λέγειν
> ⟨δοκοῦν ἅπασι, μή μ' ἐπαινέσῃ πόλις⟩
> δείσασ', ἀφήσω τῷ φόβῳ τοὐμὸν καλόν.

'I shall not keep silent and then later find fault, saying that my silence was wrong, nor yet, since everyone thinks it is no useful thing to praise a woman, shall I, being afraid lest the city praise me, let go out of fear the noble deed of which I am capable.'

304-7

> πρὸς τοῖσδε δ', εἰ μὲν μὴ ἀδικουμένοις ἐχρῆν
> τολμηρὸν εἶναι, κάρτ' ἂν εἶχον ἡσύχως.
> νῦν δ' ἴσθι σοί τε τοῦθ' ὅσην τιμὴν φέρει
> κἀμοὶ παραινεῖν οὐ φόβον φέρει, τέκνον, κτλ.

306 νῦν δ' ἴσθι Bothe: νυνὶ δὲ L τοῦθ' ὅσην Marchant: τοῦτο τὴν L

L gives νυνὶ δὲ σοί τε τοῦτο τὴν τιμὴν φέρει, adequate as sense but linguistically indefensible since deictic iota is non-tragic and the article in τὴν τιμὴν highly suspicious. There are thus separate corruptions in two places in 306, and Diggle adopts Bothe's and Marchant's conjectures to heal them. But the result is not very satisfying. The τε in 306 and the καί in 307, together with repeated φέρει, sug-

gest a parallelism between the two lines. But in 306 the point is expressed by indirect question after ἴσθι, in 307 by direct statement.

Wilamowitz, following a suggestion of Heimsoeth, replaced the unwanted τὴν by δρᾶν, which gives a welcome contrast with παραινεῖν. For the beginning of the line he wrote νῦν δ’ ἀλλά, which had already been suggested by Matthiae. The combination δ’ ἀλλά is rare in Euripides (only *Med.* 942, *Hcld.* 565, *Hec.* 391, *Ion* 978, *Pho.* 1667, and *Rhes.* 167), and this might have contributed to the accidental omission of ἀλλά, leaving a metrically defective line someone tried to repair with a deictic iota. But Denniston, *GP* 10, notes that δ’ ἀλλά is used only with an imperative expressed or implied. Perhaps, therefore, read νῦν δ’ ἐστὶ σοί τε τοῦτο δρᾶν τιμὴν φέρον (δ’ ἐστὶ . . . φέρον Wecklein olim).

365-8

ἱππόβοτον Ἄργος, ὦ πάτριον ἐμὸν πέδον,
⟨τάδ’⟩ ἐκλύετε, τάδ’ ἐκλύετε
ἄνακτος ὅσια περὶ θεοὺς
καὶ μεγάλα Πελασγίᾳ
καὶ κατ’ Ἄργος;

366 ⟨τάδ’⟩ Page

‘Horse-pasturing Argos, ground my fathers trod, have you heard, O have you heard the king speaking words that are pious as regards the gods and great *in Pelasgia and in Argos?*’ The pairing of Πελασγίᾳ and κατ’ Ἄργος disturbed Markland, who suggested Πελασγίᾳ γᾷ κατ’ Ἄργος. ‘Pelasgia’ sometimes designates the Peloponnesus, and hence Πελασγίᾳ καὶ κατ’ Ἄργος might be sufficiently protected by such whole-and-part phraseology as καθ’ Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος (*Od.* 1.344). But Pelasgia is also frequently used for Argos itself, as at *Or.* 960 and other tragic passages cited by Collard. That is what the word is likely to mean here in the mouth of an Argive speaker, especially since what Theseus said concerns only Argos, not the whole of the Peloponnesus. If so, we have two expressions for ‘Argos’ ending a stanza that began with an entire trimeter that means

nothing more than 'O Argos'. It is therefore worth suggesting, with all due tentativeness, that what Euripides gave his chorus to sing was

τάδ' ἐκλύετε
ἄνακτος ὅσια περὶ θεοὺς
καὶ μεγάλα Πελασγίᾳ
καὶ κατ' ἄνδρας;

'have you heard the king speaking to Pelasgia words that are pious and great as regards gods and men?' A marginal gloss on Πελασγίᾳ could have been misapplied to the wrong word.

399-402

τίς γῆς τύραννος; πρὸς τίν' ἀγγεῖλαί με χρὴ
λόγους Κρέοντος, ὃς κρατεῖ Κάδμου χθονὸς
'Ετεοκλέους θανόντος ἀμφ' ἑπταστόμους
πύλας ἀδελφῇ χειρὶ Πολυνείκους ὕπο;

402 ἀδελφῇ Camper: -φοῦ L

Diggle is surely right to adopt Camper's conjecture: as Collard points out, ὑπὸ χειρὶ with a possessive genitive is Homeric but not tragic. But Camper also proposed altering the end of the line to Πολυνείκους θ' ὁμοῦ. Although this is less certain, it at least deserves a place in the apparatus. In 401-2 we have an explanation of why Creon now rules Thebes. The death of Eteocles by his brother's hand is surely part of the reason, but only part, for if Polynices had survived, he, not Creon, would have been king. It is the death of the two brothers by fraternal bloodshed that constitutes the full explanation. Furthermore, in tragedy when the death of one is mentioned, the death of the other is also. An isolated reference to the death of Eteocles would be like an isolated reference to Rosencrantz. The case against such a singularity here is strong and deserves to be recognized at the foot of the page.

403-8

πρῶτον μὲν ἤρξω τοῦ λόγου ψευδῶς, ξένε,
ζητῶν τύραννον ἐνθάδ'· οὐ γὰρ ἄρχεται
ἑνὸς πρὸς ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρα πόλις.
δῆμος δ' ἀνάσσει διαδοχαῖσιν ἐν μέρει
ἐνιαυσίαισιν, οὐχὶ τῷ πλούτῳ διδοὺς
τὸ πλεῖστον, ἀλλὰ χὠ πένης ἔχων ἴσον.

To explain the construction of ἀλλὰ χὠ πένης ἔχων ἴσον Collard cites Bruhn's *Anhang*, § 19 and other examples where further nominatives with participles expand the main subject of the verb, as at *Ba.* 1131-3, ἦν δὲ πᾶσ' ὁμοῦ βοή, ὁ μὲν στενάζων ὅσον ἐτύγχαν' ἐμπνέων, αἱ δ' ὠλόλυζον or at S. *Ant.* 259-60, λόγοι δ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐρρόθουν κακοί, φύλαξ ἐλέγχων φύλακα. But these and other examples are different in important respects from our passage. First, the principal subject is a verbal abstract, such as βοή or λόγοι above, and to this the concrete subjects are put in apposition, each normally accompanied by its own participle. In our passage, δῆμος is the main subject. Second, instead of a new subject with the first of the participles, δῆμος continues as the subject of διδούς, and only with the second phrase is there a new subject. The examples in Bruhn are too different to be of help.

This difficulty has been noticed, and the most plausible solution proposed thus far is that ἔχων should be replaced by an indicative, the construction changing from participial to finite, as sometimes happens: see Denniston, *GP* 369n. Thus Herwerden proposes ἴσον σθένει or ἔλαχεν ἴσον, Holzner ἔχει μέρος, Marchant ἄρχει 'ν ἴσῳ, and Kayser ἔχει κρίσιν. None of these, however, is especially plausible: Marchant's and Kayser's give weak sense; Holzner's gives possible sense, but while the substitution of ἴσον for μέρος could be explained as the work of a supralinear gloss, the change of indicative to participle is unexplained; the first of Herwerden's conjectures gives good sense, but the corruption is hard to explain, while his second is unattractive in meter, though just barely explicable as corruption.

Should we instead delete 406-8? As I showed in *GRBS* 23 (1982), 31-50, there is a good bit of evidence that actors or others concerned

with play production interpolated verses on political themes. Theseus' reply is complete with 405, and nothing the Herald says in 409-25 alludes to the subject of annual offices. Apart from the problem in 408 there is nothing wrong with 406-8, but the use of participles in 407-8 is clumsy in a way that interpolators sometimes fall into: cf. *Andr*. 668-77, where the anacoluthon in 669 can be paralleled (see Barrett on *Hip*. 23) but the mess in 672-4 cannot.

414-6: See *GRBS* 23 (1982), 39-41.

417-25

ἄλλως τε πῶς ἂν μὴ διορθεύων λόγους
ὀρθῶς δύναιτ' ἂν δῆμος εὐθύνειν πόλιν;
ὁ γὰρ χρόνος μάθησιν ἀντὶ τοῦ τάχους
κρείσσω δίδωσι. γαπόνος δ' ἀνὴρ πένης,
εἰ καὶ γένοιτο μὴ ἀμαθής, ἔργων ὕπο
οὐκ ἂν δύναιτο πρὸς τὰ κοίν' ἀποβλέπειν.
ἦ δὴ νοσῶδες τοῦτο τοῖς ἀμείνοσιν,
ὅταν πονηρὸς ἀξίωμ' ἀνὴρ ἔχῃ
γλώσσῃ κατασχὼν δῆμον, οὐδὲν ὢν τὸ πρίν.

423-5 (quos habet Stob. 4.42.8) del. Kirchhoff ἦ δὴ hic tauntum apud Eur.

In the phrase γαπόνος δ' ἀνὴρ πένης editors construe the two adjectives with one noun as 'the poor farmer'. Denniston on *El.* 253 notes that the use of two adjectives with no adversative to connect them is common in Euripides, and he cites this passage, noting that the customary contrast between the two adjectives with one noun is lacking. In this passage, however, there would be a gain if we could take the first adjective as a predicate, 'the poor man is a farmer', for then an important minor premise would be spelled out: time is needed to learn statecraft; *the commons are farmers and since they must pay attention to their farming tasks, they have no time,* therefore the commons cannot properly guide the city. We might accordingly write ἔργων ⟨θ'⟩ ὕπο in 421.

Diggle notes the deletion of 423-5 proposed by Kirchhoff. This is attractive. As Diggle notes, the passage is introduced by a collocation of particles not found elsewhere in Euripides. Furthermore the Herald's argument meanders: in 412-6 the objection to democrary is that it elects low-born leaders who are clever knaves, deceiving the city by their rhetorical skill while they feather their own nests; in 417-22 it is that the commons are out of their depth and incapable of governing, not having the requisite education; 423-5 returns to the subject of low-born and knavish leaders, holding the people in thrall by their tongues. The first two sections make a reasonable progression. The third should probably be deleted.

440-1

καὶ ταῦθ' ὁ χρῄζων λαμπρός ἐσθ', ὁ μὴ θέλων
σιγᾷ. τί τούτων ἔστ' ἰσαίτερον πόλει;

The asyndeton in 440 between the two main clauses of one sentence is very odd. And not only do we expect a connective but we expect an adversative. Hartung proposed ὁ δ' οὐ θέλων, which surely deserved a place in Diggle's apparatus. The sense is exactly right. As for the corruption, there is a strong tendency in later Greek for οὐ with the participle to be replaced by μή. The resulting ὁ δὲ μὴ θέλων was recognized as unmetrical and the meter repaired by omission of the connective.

442-55: See *GRBS* 23 (1982), 36-9.

508-10

σφαλερὸν ἡγεμὼν θρασὺς
λεώς τε ναύτης· ἥσυχος καιρῷ, σοφός.
καὶ τοῦτό τοι τἀνδρεῖον, ἡ προμηθία.

509 λεώς Diggle: νεώς L

I print what is in effect Diggle's text: see the preface to the corrected edition (1986 and following) of his vol. ii, p. x. Certainly in

many ways Diggle's suggestion is an attractive one, but while the reading of L is hard to defend, Orelli's νέος τε ναύτης may be better. The τε will coordinate the two items in a *comparatio paratactica*: just as a young sailor is prone to error, so is a brash general. Diggle's text does not work as well as a generalization: sailors as a class (λεὼς ναύτης) are not as obviously prone to error as is a young sailor.

The next three words are taken to mean 'The man who is calm in season, he's the clever one'. The three words are rather cryptic, two adjectives, neither marked as attributive or as predicative, and a dative that could go theoretically with either. All these difficulties are addressed convincingly by Hartung's lacuna, which he supplements as follows:

ἥσυχος ⟨δὲ καὶ πόλιν
καὶ ναῦν ἔσωσε χρώμενος⟩ καιρῷ σοφῶς.
καὶ τοῦτό τοι τἀνδρεῖον, ἡ προμηθία.

'But a calm man [general or sailor] saves both his city and his ship by wisely making use of the right moment.' Here we have the adversative we might expect; ἥσυχος clearly functions as attributive; and the contrast with σφαλερόν is made by the verb ἔσωσε. Foresight, the Herald implies, is really the kind of courage deserving of the name, the kind that brings beneficial results, unlike the brashness of a young sailor.

522-7

πόλεμον δὲ τοῦτον οὐκ ἐγὼ καθίσταμαι,
ὃς οὐδὲ σὺν τοῖσδ' ἦλθον ἐς Κάδμου χθόνα·
νεκροὺς δὲ τοὺς θανόντας, οὐ βλάπτων πόλιν
οὐδ' ἀνδροκμῆτας προσφέρων ἀγωνίας,
θάψαι δικαιῶ, τὸν Πανελλήνων νόμον
σῴζων. τί τούτων ἐστὶν οὐ καλῶς ἔχον;

In 523 Denniston, *GP* 195 explains οὐδέ as, in effect, 'I am not being warlike now since I was also not warlike in the past'. This may be right, and he gives other examples of οὐδέ so used. But there is something to be said for replacing Diggle's semi-colon at the end of

523 with a comma and continuing the relative clause down to 527. In that case we should write οὔτε in 523 and νεκρούς τε in 524, the first of these suggestions being Kirchhoff's. Theseus' point is that he was not a participant in the attack of the Seven (Kirchhoff's σὺν ὅπλοις for σὺν τοῖσδ' should be resisted) and is now asking for permission to bury the bodies without engaging in war-like actions.

549-57

ἀλλ', ὦ μάταιοι, γνῶτε τἀνθρώπων κακά·
παλαίσμαθ' ἡμῶν ὁ βίος· εὐτυχοῦσι δὲ
οἱ μὲν τάχ', οἱ δ' ἐσαῦθις, οἱ δ' ἤδη βροτῶν·
τρυφᾷ δ' ὁ δαίμων· πρός τε γὰρ τοῦ δυστυχοῦς,
ὡς εὐτυχήσῃ, τίμιος γεραίρεται,
ὅ τ' ὄλβιός νιν πνεῦμα δειμαίνων λιπεῖν
ὑψηλὸν αἴρει. γνόντας οὖν χρεὼν τάδε
ἀδικουμένους τε μέτρια μὴ θυμῷ φέρειν
ἀδικεῖν τε τοιαῦθ' οἷα μὴ βλάψει πάλιν.

554 τ' Markland: δ' L 557 βλάψει Matthiae: -ψαι L πάλιν Canter: πόλιν L

At *GRBS* 23 (1982), 40, n. 31, I expressed doubt about the authenticity of these verses.[1] They still seem to me (1) to sit very loosely to their context, interrupting the business at hand, and (2) to contradict what Theseus said earlier about the divine governance of the world.

(1) Elsewhere in the speech, as in the scene as a whole, Theseus addresses his remarks to the Herald as representative of Thebes. Here, apparently, he addresses the world in general, for ὦ μάταιοι scarcely seems addressed particularly to the Thebans (cf. 744), and the general reflections on the lot of mortals are of only limited relevance to Thebes. Furthermore, everything else in the speech after the proem (517-27) is addressed to the question of burial: justice has been served by the death of the attackers (528-30); just as the spirit goes to join the upper air, so the body should be allowed to return to earth (531-6); refusal of burial is a blow not so much at Argos as at

[1] See also C. Mueller-Goldingen, *AuA* 33 (1987), 117-21.

the whole of Greece (537-41); it is evidence of irrational fears (541-8); now is the time to decide whether to allow us to act piously in burying them or to suffer the consequences of flouting the law of the gods (558-63). Murray too felt their irrelevance and proposed moving them to follow 179.

(2) The content of 549-57 is also at odds with views Theseus expresses elsewhere. In his speech to Adrastus (195-215) he describes the gods as benevolently supplying all the necessities of human life, providing men with rationality and speech, grain from the earth and water from the sky, and even divination in cases where the best course of action is unclear. We are spoiled (τρυφῶμεν), he says, if we are not satisfied with this. Here, by contrast, man's lot is described as uncertain, and the god is spoiled (τρυφᾷ) by mortals who try to win or retain his favor. The emphasis on the capriciousness of the divinity is not well suited to persuading the Thebans to honor the law of the gods. If Euripides had been writing these lines for this place, one feels, he would have had Theseus express himself differently. The reference to putting up with *moderate* injury does not fit well with the emphasis elsewhere on resisting injury *tout court* (304, 574-5), and Theseus does not elsewhere recommend or condone doing only moderate wrong but speaks of his own city's conduct as clearly right (526-7, 561-3, 671-2) and that of Thebes as clearly wrong (432, 575). Perhaps, as Murray's transposition suggests, the sentiments are closer to those of Adrastus, but wherever they might have come from, they do not belong here and we should bracket them.

584-8

περαίνομεν γὰρ οὐδέν. ὁρμᾶσθαι χρεὼν
πάντ' ἄνδρ' ὁπλίτην ἁρμάτων τ' ἐπεμβάτην
μοναμπύκων τε φάλαρα κινεῖσθαι †στόμα†
ἀφρῷ καταστάζοντα Καδμείαν[1] χθόνα.
χωρήσομαι γὰρ ἑπτὰ πρὸς Κάδμου πύλας, κτλ.

586-7 fort. totum distichon obelo notare debebam

[1] At *Euripidea* 143 Diggle corrects the misprint Καδμείων.

Diggle, *Studies* 15-7, indicates that he has no solution to the problem of 586-7 and is merely attempting to define it. To make its nature apparent he translates: 'Forward must go every hoplite and charioteer, and the single-horses' cheek-pieces, making the mouth drip with foam ["dripping at the mouth with foam" Collard], must be set in motion to the Cadmean land.' Cheek-pieces dripping with foam would be acceptable, but since they neither make *the mouth* drip with foam or drip *at the mouth* with foam, suspicion must rest on στόμα. Diggle tentatively replaces it with στόλον, an easy corruption, and takes καταστάζοντα as masculine, giving the sense 'the rider of chariots and the *detachment* of single horses must be set in motion toward the Cadmean land, making their cheek-pieces drip with foam'. This, he says, restores a proper distribution of the roles, for 'we want the horses to move and the cheek-pieces to drip'. He notes that the hyperbaton is rather violent but cites Stinton, *PCPS* n.s. 21 (1975), 82-8 (=*CPGT* 98-106) for parallels.

Diggle's diffidence about this conjecture (i. e. his opening remark about having no solution) seems justified. Stinton's examples may parallel the interlacing of main clause and participial phrase, but Diggle's proposal is vitiated by the fact that the genitive μοναμπύκων stands next to φάλαρα and at a considerable distance from στόλον, thereby making the sentence extremely difficult to understand.

In view of this it may not be otiose to propose another line of attack, one that takes as its point of departure a different grouping of the words in 585-6. It seems slightly more natural to put a comma after ὁπλίτην, taking that word only, not ὁπλίτην and ἐπεμβάτην, as the subject of ὁρμᾶσθαι. Then the subject of the second infinitive is ἁρμάτων ἐπεμβάτην μοναμπύκων τε, 'riders of chariots and of single horses'. If so, then φάλαρα is the object of the verb, and we can make the easy change of κινῆσαι for κινεῖσθαι. (Cf. the opposite error, θυμῶσαι for θυμοῦσθαι, in 581.) This gives us normal word-order and an even better distribution of roles, for now it is riders, not horses, who are doing the moving, and the cheek-pieces are the object of their action. We must still alter the impossible στόμα, and for this I suggest πρόσω.[1] The word is used in this military sense at *Il.* 11. 615, 12.274, etc., A. *Ag.* 853, Hdt. 7.30, etc. The lack of resem-

---

[1] Also possible is δρόμῳ, suggested by C. Mueller-Goldingen, *AuA* 33 (1987), 121.

blance between πρόσω and στόμα need not trouble us since, as Diggle notes, 'it is just conceivable that στόμα may have begun life as a gloss στόμια'. Read, therefore,

ὁρμᾶσθαι χρεὼν
πάντ' ἄνδρ' ὁπλίτην, ἁρμάτων τ' ἐπεμβάτην
μοναμπύκων τε φάλαρα κινῆσαι πρόσω
ἀφρῷ καταστάζοντα Καδμείαν χθόνα.

'All hoplites must set out, and riders of chariots or of single horses must move their cheek-pieces, dripping with foam, forward toward the land of Thebes.'

686-93

οὐκ ἔχω
τί πρῶτον εἴπω, πότερα τὴν ἐς οὐρανὸν
κόνιν προσαντέλλουσαν, ὡς πολλὴ παρῆν,
ἢ τοὺς ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω φορουμένους
ἱμᾶσιν, αἵματός τε φοινίου ῥοὰς
τῶν μὲν πιτνόντων, τῶν δὲ θραυσθέντων δίφρων
ἐς κρᾶτα πρὸς γῆν ἐκκυβιστώντων βίᾳ
πρὸς ἁρμάτων τ' ἀγαῖσι λειπόντων βίον.

689 τοὺς ... φορουμένους Heath: τὰς ... φορουμένας L

Heath changed L's curious feminine plural participle and accompanying article to masculine. Diggle does the same. But why would a scribe have altered the masculine to a feminine? And even if we concede that the ways of scribes are sometimes past finding out, how satisfactory is the text achieved by this supposition? I find it impossible to believe that Euripides' messenger, giving a preliminary overview of the battle, should talk so vaguely of men 'being carried back and forth by means of leather thongs' or even 'by means of leather harnesses'. Surely ἱμᾶσιν leads us to expect a description of people being entangled in the reins or other equipment and dragged to their death: to have them 'carried back and forth' is both trivial and vague. We should adopt Kirchhoff's lacuna after 689 and retain the feminine

participle. What is 'carried back and forth' is a feminine plural entity, perhaps waves of shields. I give an illustrative supplement:

ἢ τὰς ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω φορουμένας
⟨ὥσπερ θαλάσσης ἀσπίδων τρικυμίας,
εἶτ' ἐμπλακέντας ἱππικαῖς ἐν ἡνίαις
ἄνδρας τραχείας πρὸς πέτρας φορουμένους⟩
ἱμᾶσιν, αἵματός τε φοινίου ῥοὰς
τῶν μὲν πιτνόντων, τῶν δὲ θραυσθέντων δίφρων κτλ.

694-703

νικῶντα δ' ἵπποις ὡς ὑπείδετο στρατὸν
Κρέων τὸν ἐνθένδ', ἰτέαν λαβὼν χερὶ
χωρεῖ πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ξυμμάχοις δυσθυμίαν.
καὶ μὴν τὰ Θησέως γ' οὐκ ὄκνῳ διεφθάρη,
ἀλλ' ἵετ' εὐθὺς λάμπρ' ἀναρπάσας ὅπλα.
κὰς μέσον ἅπαντα συμπατάξαντες στρατὸν
ἔκτεινον ἐκτείνοντο καὶ παρηγγύων
κελευσμὸν ἀλλήλοισι σὺν πολλῇ βοῇ·
Θεῖν'· Ἀντέρειδε τοῖς Ἐρεχθείδαις δόρυ.
λόχος δ' ὀδόντων ὄφεος ἐξηνδρωμένος, κτλ.

699 ita Diggle: καὶ συμπατάξαντες μέσον πάντα στρατὸν L 702 dist. Elmsley

Diggle adopts Elmsley's division of 702 between the two armies, the one group saying, θεῖν', the other ἀντέρειδε τοῖς Ἐρεχθείδαις δόρυ. But it is a common feature of Euripides' style to begin a trimeter with two verbs in asyndeton that are synonyms or near-synonyms: cf. *Hec.* 1044 ἄρασσε, φείδου μηδέν and other examples in Collard on *Su.* 699-700a, Bond on *HF* 602, and Mastronarde on *Pho.* 1193. This suggests that Elmsley's division, with each of the synonyms uttered by a different speaker, is unlikely to be correct. Furthermore, it makes large demands on the actor, who will be hard put to make it plain that the first syllable in the line belongs to one set of speakers and all the rest to another. The line should not be divided.

What then shall we do? The desirability of reporting the battle cry of both armies is ground common to both Elmsley and Wilamowitz, who marked a lacuna after 702, writing 'interciderunt clamores Atheniensium'. But what if 697-8 did not precede 702? Both Murray and P. Burian, *CR* 24 (1974), 175-6, suggest that the two lines about Theseus belong somewhere else. The case Burian makes that 697-8 are intrusive in their transmitted place is strong. Without 697-8 συμπατάξαντες . . . ἔκτεινον ἐκτείνοντο may refer to the Theban forces, not the leaders of the two armies. The Theban forces can be said to 'kill and be killed', whereas Creon and Theseus cannot. Likewise, the Theban forces can 'pass the exhortation *to one another*', but Creon and Theseus may not, but only to their own men, surely an odd sense for ἀλλήλοις. Lastly, if we have been talking of Thebans only, the Theban battle cry is all we require at this point: Theseus' exhortation to his men comes later.

Since the context makes the excision of 697-8 from their transmitted place attractive, where do we put them on the assumption that they have been copied in the wrong place? Burian suggests after 706. This is possible. But 707, with its suggestion that Theseus has not been the subject of the preceding sentence, does not follow perfectly on 698. Rather 706-7 is a highly plausible sequence, and there is nothing to indicate a lacuna. There is a place, however, where a lacuna is probable, though not for the reasons its proposer alleged. Wilamowitz, as noted above, proposed a lacuna after 702 to accommodate the 'clamores Atheniensium', but, as we have seen, this is not necessary if the Athenians have not yet been mentioned. But 703 surely implies that the subject has changed, that the messenger has been talking of someone else and now turns to the λόχος ὀδόντων ὄφεος. Yet up until now, if 697-8 are removed, 694-702 have been about the Theban forces, and λόχος δ' ὀδόντων ὄφεος ἐξανδρωμένος makes less than perfect sense as the beginning of the next sentence. Following 696, 697-8 are unwanted, and following 702 there seems to be a gap. Murray drew the conclusion that 697-8 came from there and produced this highly attractive sequence:

νικῶντα δ' ἵπποις ὡς ὑπείδετο στρατὸν
Κρέων τὸν ἐνθένδ', ἰτέαν λαβὼν χερὶ 695
χωρεῖ πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ξυμμάχοις δυσθυμίαν. 696
κὰς μέσον ἅπαντα συμπατάξαντες στρατὸν 699
ἔκτεινον ἐκτείνοντο καὶ παρηγγύων 700
κελευσμὸν ἀλλήλοισι σὺν πολλῇ βοῇ·
Θεῖν', ἀντέρειδε τοῖς Ἐρεχθείδαις δόρυ. 702
καὶ μὴν τὰ Θησέως γ' οὐκ ὄκνῳ διεφθάρη, 697
ἀλλ' ἵετ' εὐθὺς λάμπρ' ἀναρπάσας ὅπλα. 698
λόχος δ' ὀδόντων ὄφεος ἐξηνδρωμένος, κτλ. 703

The narrative continues with the evenness of the battle (the Athenian left being routed, the Athenian right victorious) and Theseus' decision to throw all his efforts into Athens' weakest spot.

731-3

νῦν τήνδ' ἄελπτον ἡμέραν ἰδοῦσ' ἐγὼ
θεοὺς νομίζω καὶ δοκῶ τὰς συμφορὰς
ἔχειν ἐλάσσους τῶνδε τεισάντων δίκην.

733 ἐλάσσους Markland: ἔλασσον L, quo servato τῆς συμφορᾶς Scaliger (συμφορᾶς) et Heath

The outcome the Chorus rejoice at is 'unlooked for', and such outcomes are characteristic of the gods' work in the world. So the connection of the participial phrase with θεοὺς νομίζω is perfectly clear. The rest is defensible with Markland's ἐλάσσους: 'and I think that I have misfortunes that are less since these men have paid the penalty'. But a closer connection with what precedes, the subject of the gods' action in the world, is possible if we adopt a different tack. Not rarely συμφοραί means 'the events of people's lives' (conceived as either chance or purposive), as at 610-1: —δικαίους δαίμονας σύ γ' ἐννέπεις. —τίνες γὰρ ἄλλοι νέμουσι συμφοράς; In several places in Euripides the gods are contrasted with chance circumstance, as at *Cycl.* 606-7

ἢ τὴν τύχην μὲν δαίμον' ἡγεῖσθαι χρεών,
τὰ δαιμόνων δὲ τῆς τύχης ἐλάσσονα.

and *Hec.* 488-91

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί λέξω; πότερά σ' ἀνθρώπους ὁρᾶν
ἢ δόξαν ἄλλως τήνδε κεκτῆσθαι μάτην,
τύχην δὲ πάντα τἀν βροτοῖς ἐπισκοπεῖν;

The Chorus could be saying that they believe the gods to be more powerful than circumstances if we alter not ἔλασσον but ἔχειν:

νῦν τήνδ' ἄελπτον ἡμέραν ἰδοῦσ' ἐγὼ
θεοὺς νομίζω καὶ δοκῶ τὰς συμφορὰς
σθένειν ἔλασσον τῶνδε τεισάντων δίκην.

'I believe in the gods and think that circumstances are less powerful (than the gods) since these men have been punished.'

818-20

Αδ. ἔχεις ἔχεις Χο. πημάτων γ' ἅλις βάρος.
Αδ. αἰαῖ. ⟨Χο.⟩ τοῖς τεκοῦσι δ' οὐ λέγεις;
Αδ. ἀίετέ μου. Χο. στένεις ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν ἄχη.

819-20 fort. corrupti

Collard translates 819 'but do you not lament (λέγεις;: i. e. <αἰαῖ> λέγεις sc. αἰάζεις) for our sake, the mothers?', and he comments that this seems petty. Rather it is unintelligible. The context makes it difficult to supply the interjection with λέγεις, but even more crucial, when λέγειν is immediately preceded or followed by a dative, that dative will be taken as an indirect object, and Collard's attempt to construe it as dative of advantage is doomed. Likewise difficult is 820, where 'you lament over both parties for their troubles' is not fully convincing. Diggle is right to suspect corruption.

Comparison with *Alc.* 871-8 ~ 889-94 shows that Euripides will sometimes have complete statments in the strophe and *sermo inter-*

ruptus in the antistrophe. Our best hope for making sense of the present passage is to assume that Adrastus' imperative in 820 interrupts a single utterance by the Chorus. The best I can come up with is

Αδ. αἰαῖ. ⟨Χο.⟩ τοῖς τεκοῦσι δ' εὖ δοκεῖς . . .
Αδ. ἀίετέ μου. Χο. στένειν, ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν δ' ἄχη.

The Chorus's last utterance benefits from being divided between two sentences, for it is sensible to say 'but these woes press on both parties'. But any solution is highly speculative since the changes are so numerous. Others may be able to do better.

842-5

εἰπὲ δ' ὡς σοφώτερος
νέοισιν ἀστῶν τῶνδ'· ἐπιστήμων γὰρ εἶ.
εἶδον γὰρ αὐτῶν κρείσσον' ἢ λέξαι λόγῳ
τολμήμαθ' οἷς ἤλπιζον αἱρήσειν πόλιν.

Theseus is asking Adrastus to explain the valor of the seven attacking generals. But the reason he gives for this request in 844-5 makes less than perfect sense: 'I (or they, the young of Athens) saw their deeds (and hence want to know what lies behind them)'. Theseus, after all, was not present at the attack of the Seven nor were the young men of Athens. All they have seen is their corpses. It is well-nigh impossible to infer 'brave deeds greater than tongue can tell' from inspection of dead bodies, and if a poet is going to try to make the impossible seem plausible, we expect him to spell out that this was an inference rather than say baldly 'I saw their brave deeds'. Transpose the lines with Camper to follow 859 and all is well:

Αδ. ἄκουε δή νυν· καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἄκοντί μοι
δίδως ἔπαινον ὧν ἔγωγε βούλομαι
φίλων ἀληθῆ καὶ δίκαι' εἰπεῖν πέρι. 859
εἶδον γὰρ αὐτῶν κρείσσον' ἢ λέξαι λόγῳ 844
τολμήμαθ' οἷς ἤλπιζον αἱρήσειν πόλιν. 845

In their new location the lines explain why Adrastus' praise is both truthful (for he personally saw the Seven in action) and just (for their deeds were astonishing).

867-71

φίλοις τ' ἀληθὴς ἦν φίλος παροῦσί τε
καὶ μὴ παροῦσιν· ὧν ἀριθμὸς οὐ πολύς.
ἀψευδὲς ἦθος, εὐπροσήγορον στόμα,
ἄκρατον οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἐς οἰκέτας ἔχων
οὔτ' ἐς πολίτας.

867 φίλοις . . . παροῦσί Reiske: φίλος . . . τοῖς παροῦσί L

The asyndeton in 869 could be accounted for as explicative. 'He was a true friend to his friends both present and absent: (for) he had (supply αὐτῷ) a character that told no lies and a mouth that was affable'. But this leaves ἔχων in 870 without anything to modify. We could supply 'he was' in 869, but while that is plausible with ἦθος, it is difficult for στόμα. Finally, we could take both ἦθος and στόμα as objects of ἔχων. But that participle already governs ἄκρατον οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἐς οἰκέτας . . . οὔτ' ἐς πολίτας, and it seems contrary to style for it to take two other objects of quite different character. The passage can be made to read naturally only if we assume a lacuna whose contents could be as follows:

ὧν ἀριθμὸς οὐ πολύς.
⟨πρὸς οὓς ἔδειξεν ἐν βίου συναλλαγαῖς⟩
ἀψευδὲς ἦθος, εὐπροσήγορον στόμα,
ἄκρατον οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἐς οἰκέτας ἔχων
οὔτ' ἐς πολίτας.

ELECTRA

1

ὮΩ γῆς †παλαιὸν Ἄργος†, Ἰνάχου ῥοαί, κτλ.

1 παλαιὸς (vel -ᾶς) ἀρδμός Herwerden, παλαιᾶς ὅρμος Zuntz cl. Hec. 450

'O ancient Argos of the land, waters of Inachus.' This is clearly not right and has provoked numerous conjectures. Our first task must be to determine the seat of the difficulty, our second to diagnose what misfortune has given rise to the transmitted text, and the third to find a possible replacement for what has been corrupted.

Ἰνάχου ῥοαί, although it has sometimes been challenged (e. g. by Schneidewin's Ἰνάχου γύαι), should provisionally be considered sound. The phrase is Euripidean (cf. *Hel.* 1), and it accords with the situation of the Autourgos's cottage. He lives out in the country, far from the city of Argos. What he sees and apostrophizes is not Argos itself but its principal river. It likewise seems unpromising to challenge Ὦ γῆς.

The next two words are a different matter. Ἄργος makes no sense at all, either as a proper name or as the (unattested) common noun 'plain'. Whatever expression once stood before the comma, it has to be something to which Ἰνάχου ῥοαί can stand in apposition, and neither a city nor a plain can be identified with the streams of a river. παλαιόν is not as obviously objectionable as Ἄργος, but it too creates difficulties. For what ancient thing is it which is another way of saying the streams of Inachus? And what is the relevant sense of παλαιός: former? long-standing? revered? At this stage we have followed Diggle in putting a dagger to the left of παλαιὸν and another to the right of Ἄργος.

What is the origin of the text we have before us? There is only one answer I can see. Ἄργος must be a gloss that has invaded the text. It is not a gloss for the whole expression preceding the comma, for that expression must be another way of referring to the Inachus.

The gloss was intended to identify the γῆ in question, and it ended up replacing the nominative on which γῆς depends.

Zuntz suggests Ὦ γῆς παλαιᾶς ὅρμος, 'O steading of an ancient land', and Haslam revives Herwerden's Ὦ γῆς παλαιὸς ἀρδμός, 'O ancient source of the land's water'. Neither is quite right in sense. Against the first, the Inachus is not a very large river—it is a dry bed in summer—and there seems to be no evidence that in antiquity anyone used it as a steading for ships. The second is more promising. But 'ancient' is otiose: why suggest that the Inachus has been around for a long time (it has, of course, but so what?), or that it used to water the land but does so no more, or that it enjoys the reverence accorded to age? None of these is particularly plausible, and all lead the audience down false trails.

The second version of Herwerden's proposal, γῆς παλαιᾶς ἀρδμός, is better from a paleographic standpoint: it is much easier for the hypothesis that Ἄργος replaced e. g. ἀρδμός if in the original text there stood where παλαιὸν now stands an expression, such as an adjective or adnominal genitive, modifying γῆς. If Ἄργος had been written as a gloss on γῆς and directly over it, it is hard to see why it should have been copied where it now stands, whereas if it were a gloss on γῆς ⟨ ⟩ας, overhanging the end of the second word by a centimeter or so, it might have been incorporated into the text after the adjective. But the merits of this conjecture are offset by a disadvantage, for why is Argos singled out as peculiarly 'ancient'?

We may be able to do better. What expression, modifying γῆς, could be taken to mean Argos and be sufficiently roundabout to attract a gloss? And what is the word obliterated by the gloss? As to the second, I doubt we could improve on Herwerden's ἀρδμός. There is no need for the word to resemble Ἄργος in the shape of its letters, but similarity could well have facilitated the process of substitution.

For the first Semitelos' Πελασγῶν is highly attractive. The ethnic is associated with many places in Greece, but Argos is in their number: cf. *HF* 464. This is likely to have attracted the gloss Ἄργος, and Πελασγῶν looks something like παλαιόν. But in cases of accidental obliteration by a gloss, certainty is rarely to be had, and I feel obliged to mention another possibility. The Autourgos is imagined to be living at a considerable distance from the town of Argos, in the

mountains (cf. 168, 210, 342, 489-90). He might well have apostrophized Inachus as giving water to a rocky, rugged terrain: Ὦ γῆς λεπαίας ἀρδμός. Anagrammatism could have produced πελαίας *vel sim.* and, once ἀρδμός had been ousted by Ἄργος, 'correction' to παλαιὸν could have followed. Euripides uses λεπαῖος in three places. It is not found in Aeschylus or Sophocles.

4

κτείνας δὲ τὸν κρατοῦντ' ἐν Ἰλιάδι χθονὶ κτλ.

'There is no reason whatever to emend. A fifth foot anapaest formed by a proper name scanning — u u — is common: see J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique des iambographes à la comédie nouvelle*, Mâcon, 1931, pp. 197-8, 207-8.' Thus Denniston, and his argument satisfied Diggle. But it ought not to have. The license of — u u — in trimeters is accorded to proper names of heroes whose earliest home was in hexameter verse. Ἱππολύτου, Ἀνδρομάχη, Παρθενοπαῖος, Ἰφιγένεια and the like cannot be accommodated by any other means, and hence the anapest is allowed to stand.[1] But extending this license to adjectives is a different matter. The tetrasyllabic forms of Ἰλιάς are not elsewhere so used. Only two other adjectives are cited by Descroix, and only one survives scrutiny. At Soph. fr. 777 R. the manuscripts of the Etymologicum Genuinum give τρύχει καλυφθεὶς Θεσσαλικῆς ἀπληγίδος, but Dindorf, F. Ellendt, Wilamowitz, and Radt all agree in banishing the prosaic adjective in favor of Θεσσαλῆς. Only Ταυροπόλον at *IT* 1457, a cult title rather than an adjective, is allowed anapestic treatment. To be quite certain that Ἰλιάδι here is a singularity, I looked at all the adjectives with capital letters in Allen and Italie's concordance and found no instance where they create anapestic rhythm in trimeter. The license in question is also not extended to patronymics such as Ἰλιάδαι or Τυνδαρίδαι. The reason is intuitively obvious: this rhythm is an extremely unwelcome one in trimeters, and only cases of

[1] Contrast the nominative or accusative forms of Hippolytus' name, which can be accommodated by resolution. I have found only four instances in Euripides where a theoretically resolvable form of a choriambic name is allowed to make an anapestic rhythm, Νεοπτόλεμος at *Tro.* 1126 and *Or.* 1655, Οἰνόμαον at *IT* 82 and Ταυροπόλον at *IT* 1457.

genuine need, not adjectives or patronymics that could be replaced by other locutions, are allowed.

We have here a phenomenon unique in the whole of extant tragedy. In order to emend we have only to see how easy a corruption yields ΙΛΙΑΔΙ from Elmsley's ΙΔΑΙΑΙ. Each of these words has three letters of triangular shape interspersed among three uprights. The order of the triangles and uprights is almost identical, only one transposition being required. The weary eye of the scribe knew that Priam was the ruler in Ilium and wrote what he thought Euripides must have meant but did not in fact write. Euripides uses Ἰδαῖος to mean nothing more than 'Trojan' at *Hec*. 325, 354, *El*. 317, *Tro*. 199, *Hel*. 658, and *Or*. 1380.

8-10

κἀκεῖ μὲν εὐτύχησεν · ἐν δὲ δώμασιν
θνῄσκει γυναικὸς πρὸς Κλυταιμήστρας δόλῳ
καὶ τοῦ Θυέστου παιδὸς Αἰγίσθου χερί.

All may not be well in 9-10 as transmitted. They attempt to say, but with imperfect success, 'He was killed by the treacherous devising of Clytaemestra his wife and by the hand of Aegisthus', plotter and executor being sharply distinguished. But in 9 as transmitted, θνῄσκει γυναικὸς πρὸς Κλυταιμήστρας δόλῳ means 'he was killed treacherously by Clytaemestra, his wife', and the contrast between plotter and doer is blurred. Note too the lack of parallelism: χερί has a defining genitive, δόλῳ has none. Anyone disinclined to suspicion could defend the paradosis by translating 'he was killed treacherously by his wife Clytaemestra and by the hand of Aegisthus', but χερί, going only with Aegisthus, looks odd.

Attempts to fix this are of two kinds, restoring the parallelism and abandoning the attempt at it. In the former category is Weil's ἐκ Κλυταιμήστρας δόλου. This gives parallelism, but the double corruption is hard to explain. In the latter category are F. W. Schmidt's ὁμοῦ for δόλῳ and C. Haupt's αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ for Αἰγίσθου χερὶ. Schmidt's suggestion, 'at once by Clytaemestra and Aegisthus', lacks point, and the emphasis on Aegisthus' hand (but not Clytaemestra's) is not addressed. Haupt's suggestion is mere rewriting.

Weil had earlier considered deleting 10, and Klinkenberg proposed doing so. This is likely to be right. Line 9 as transmitted needs no change. What it says plainly is that Clytaemestra killed Agamemnon. This is inconsistent with 10, which lays the responsibility for doing the deed exclusively on Aegisthus. Furthermore 10 is inelegantly written with its clumsy string of genitives. The reason for its invention is patent. As Denniston notes ad loc., this play gives Aegisthus a larger role in the murder of Agamemnon than usual. Yet here he is given no role at all. This is understandable—here emphasis is meant to fall on the ignominy of murder by one's wife—but someone who imagined a contradiction was tempted to try to bring this passage into line with the rest of the play. Unfortunately for him (and fortunately for us) he overshot the mark: elsewhere Aegisthus has a hand in the killing, whereas here the interpolator made him the only one to wield a weapon. This is not how the Chorus envisage the murder at 1156-64.

54-61: See *AJP* 105 (1984), 238.

82-4

Πυλάδη, σὲ γὰρ δὴ πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων ἐγὼ
πιστὸν νομίζω καὶ φίλον ξένον τ' ἐμοί·
μόνος δ' Ὀρέστην τόνδ' ἐθαύμαζες φίλων, κτλ.

83 πίστιν Camper cl. A. Pe. 443

Diggle seems a little worried about this passage, to judge from his apparatus, where he cites Camper's πίστιν for L's πιστὸν. I suppose this is intended as an accusative of respect, as it appears to be also in the Aeschylus passage he cites as a parallel. Certainly the adjective πιστὸν is difficult, for in that case we have the series adjective-noun-noun joined as if it were three nouns, that is with καὶ joining the first pair and τε the second. There is no way that with καὶ where it is 82-3 can mean 'Pylades, I consider you first among men to be my faithful friend and host.'

Yet this is surely what we expect the lines to mean. As long as καὶ is standing there, it cannot mean this, for καὶ A B τε is no sub-

stitute for A καὶ B, A τε καὶ B or καὶ A καὶ B. We must get rid of the καὶ. Read σύννομον for καὶ φίλον. Then πιστὸν can modify both nouns without impediment. σύννομος is a good tragic word for friend or companion, occurring at least twice in Sophocles. The adjective, though not the substantive, occurs elsewhere in Euripides. It is not extravagant to assume the nominal usage here. It is rare enough to be glossed by the word φίλος. When the gloss had replaced the original word, a καὶ was put in to repair the meter.

87: See *Euripidea* 169-70.

112-3 (=127-8)

σύντειν' (ὥρα) ποδὸς ὁρμάν· ὤ,
ἔμβα ἔμβα κατακλαίουσα.

112 ᾠδᾷ Willink

There are two oddities in 113. Of the parallels alleged by Denniston for *brevis in longo* at the end of a full anapestic dimeter, *IT* 147 is a paroemiac and *Ion* 167 could be cured, as Diggle's app. crit. points out, by transposing two lines. The hiatus of ἔμβα ἔμβα is also without parallel. Both may be put right by what Cobet called the *tutissima corrigendi via*, transposition of two words: read ἔμβα κατακλαίουσ', ἔμβα. For the split anadiplosis, see Willink on *Or*. 200. Note that the resulting paroemiac is a good clausula to the acatalectic dimeter above.

Willink's ᾠδᾷ for ὥρα has a great deal to be said for it. The word then corresponds to κατακλαίουσα in the following line giving close parallelism of thought.

122: See below on *Tro.* 592-4.

162-6

οὐ μίτραισι γυνά σε
δέξατ' οὐδ' ἐπὶ στεφάνοις,
ξίφεσι δ' ἀμφιτόμοις λυγρὰν

Αἰγίσθου λώβαν θεμένα
δόλιον ἔσχεν ἀκοίταν.

In 162 L has μίτραις σε γυνή. The position of the pronoun looks attractive, and the lack of a syllable should not be repaired by Seidler's μίτραισι γυνή σε but by keeping the reading of L and adopting Willink's μίτραις σε γυνὰ ⟨σά⟩.

In 164-5 Denniston translates ξίφεσι δ' ἀμφιτόμοις λυγρὰν Αἰγίσθου λώβαν θεμένα as 'making him the piteous victim of Aegisthus' sword.' He concedes that the word-order is difficult. I would call it impossible that Αἰγίσθου, standing between λυγρὰν and λώβαν, should modify ξίφεσι. Furthermore, I can find no instance where λώβα, which means maltreatment or outrage, is ever used of the person who suffers this treatment. θεμένα would seem to be an instance of the periphrastic use of τίθεσθαι: see LSJ s.v. C. λυγρὰν Αἰγίσθου λώβαν θεμένα could only mean 'committing a grim outrage against Aegisthus.' Bothe's Αἰγίσθῳ gives the required sense.

237-8

Ηλ. λόγον δὲ δὴ τίν' ἦλθες ἐκ κείνου φέρων;
Ορ. εἰ ζῇς, ὅπως τε ζῶσα συμφορᾶς ἔχεις.

Electra asks, 'What word do you bring from Orestes?' and the disguised Orestes replies 'Whether you are alive and, if alive, how your fortunes stand.' If this is correct, we must supply 'He says he wants to know' with Orestes' answer. This is not easy, however, and we might consider the possibility of a lacuna.

Ηλ. λόγον δὲ δὴ τίν' ἦλθες ἐκ κείνου φέρων;
⟨Ορ. ἐς τήνδε γῆν μ' ἔπεμψ' ἵν' ἐξεύρω τινά.
Ηλ. τὰ ποῖα; πάντ' ἄν, εἴ τι γιγνώσκω, κλύοις.⟩
Ορ. εἰ ζῇς, ὅπως τε ζῶσα συμφορᾶς ἔχεις.

Homoiarkton of postulated ε(ἰ)ς with the εἰ of 238 will have caused the omission.

274-5: See *BICS* 36 (1989), 69, n. 5.

282

εἴθ' ἦν Ὀρέστης πλησίον κλύων τάδε.

Camper's κλύειν is highly attractive in view of *Hip.* 294, *Or.* 1473 and parallels cited by Barrett and Willink.

307-13: See *CQ* 35 (1985), 306-10.

314

μήτηρ δ' ἐμὴ Φρυγίοισιν ἐν σκυλεύμασιν

The evidence that Euripides admitted proper names of the shape u u — u into the trimeter elsewhere than at the very beginning is the following: the present passage; *HF* 220 ὃς εἷς Μινύαισι πᾶσι διὰ μάχης μολὼν; *Hel.* 88 Τελαμών, Σαλαμὶς δὲ πατρὶς ἡ θρέψασά με; *Or.* 459 ἀπωλόμην, Μενέλαε· Τυνδάρεως ὅδε; *IA* 1604 πέμπει δ' Ἀγαμέμνων μ' ὥστε σοι φράσαι τάδε. Both the *IA* and the *Helen* passage are later additions, as is clear from the anapests all around them (see *Hel.* 86 and the end of the *IA* passim).[1] The *HF* passage can be restored to normal rhythm by simple rearrangement, Elmsley's Μινύαις ὃς εἷς ἅπασι, and Diggle adopts this. It is surprising, therefore, that the remaining two passages should have been so respectfully treated by Diggle. At *Or.* 459 Elmsley (again) wrote Μενέλα', ἀπωλόμεσθα, a transposition as simple as that at *HF* 220. At our present passage Elmsley wrote μήτηρ δ' ἐμὴ Φρυγῶν μὲν ἐν σκυλεύμασιν. This is not as happy as the other two emendations, for Φρυγίοισι seems protected against Φρυγῶν by 1001-1 σκύλοισι . . . Φρυγίοις, *Tro.* 18 Φρύγιά τε σκυλεύματα, 1206-7 σκυλευμάτων / Φρυγίων, *Or.* 1434 σκύλων Φρυγίων, and many other passages where Φρύγιος is used as the adjective of Φρύξ. No simple transposition produces acceptable meter, and the passage perhaps deserves a

---

[1] S. *Phil.* 794 is also to be ascribed to a later hand.

dagger, but we might consider μήτηρ δὲ πολεμίοισιν ἐν σκυλεύμασιν (cf. *Pho.* 857) or μήτηρ δὲ Φρυγίοις ⟨γαῦρος⟩ ἐν σκυλεύμασιν.

391-5

ἀλλ' ἄξιος γὰρ ὅ τε παρὼν ὅ τ' οὐ παρὼν
'Αγαμέμνονος παῖς, οὗπερ οὕνεχ' ἥκομεν,
δεξώμεθ' οἴκων καταλύσεις. χωρεῖν χρεών,
δμῶες, δόμων τῶνδ' ἐντός. ὡς ἐμοὶ πένης
εἴη πρόθυμος πλουσίου μᾶλλον ξένος.

Orestes, who continues to conceal his identity, gives his reason in 391-2 for accepting the humble hospitality of the Autourgos, but the reason is hard to understand: 'both the man who is present and the one who is absent, the son of Agamemnon on whose behalf we have come, are worthy'. Worthy of what? Of a humble cottage in the mountains? That has no plausibility. Since 391 gives the reason for the hortatory subjunctive in 393, the sense calls for a different adjective indicating that both Orestes and himself *have a reason to accept such hospitality*. Best sense, at the cost of trivial change, is given by ἄξενος. It is true that the word elsewhere means 'inhospitable', and I can find no instance where it means 'without a guest-friend'. But to argue by analogy, καράτομος means 'decapitated' everywhere in Greek literature except S. *El.* 52, where it signifies a lock 'cut from the head'. Equally good sense, at slightly greater cost, is given by ἄστεγος, 'lacking shelter'.

Note that translation cannot express the ambiguity of ὅ τε παρὼν ὅ τ' οὐ παρὼν 'Αγαμέμνονος παῖς. Orestes wants to be understood as speaking of two people, the man who is here and the absent son of Agamemnon, but the secret sense of his words is 'the son of Agamemnon who is both absent (since there in concealment) and present (in reality)'.

413-4

κέλευε δ' †αὐτὸν τόνδ' ἐς δόμους ἀφιγμένον†
ἐλθεῖν ξένιά τ' ἐς δαῖτα πορσῦναί τινα.

Electra sends her husband to fetch the old retainer who rescued Orestes. Her instructions become garbled at 413, and Diggle daggers the passage as above.

The line is a syllable too long. Scaliger simply deleted τόνδ', and the result was explained by Paley: 'The man was in the fields with his flocks; he must therefore return to his own house for provisions, and then come to the cottage of the autourgos.' This will not do, since we have not been told that he is in the fields.

Others write ἀφιγμένων and make it a genitive absolute with either αὐτῶν [τόνδε] (Denniston) or δ' οὖν τῶνδ' (Vitelli) or δ' ὡς τῶνδ' (Willink) as the fourth and fifth syllables of the line. There is nothing conclusively wrong with these, but it strikes me as a bit pedantic to say 'Bid him come, since these men have arrived at the house'. Denniston's is the only one to explain the extra syllable (the 'him' understood with 'bid' being written above the line and then incorporated as text), but αὐτῶν, 'they', where we expect τούτων 'these men', mades it the weakest of the lot. The others allow no easy explanation of the corruption. Furthermore we do not really need Electra to spell out to the Autourgos the explanation he is to give of his request for provisions. That is a matter which can easily be left to him.

By contrast L's κέλευε δ' αὐτὸν τόνδ' has one important thing in its favor. It is crucial for the development of the plot that the old retainer not merely provide food but also bring it himself: he is the only one who can bring about the recognition. Read therefore Musgrave's ἀφιγμένος, preceded by ἐκεῖσ' (my own contribution): 'when you get there [this picks up ἔλθ' in 409 and the directions in 410-1], bid the man himself come and bring some provisions for a feast. He will be delighted and will pray to the gods when he hears, etc.' ἐς δόμους is an explanation for ἐκεῖσ' that invaded the text.

504a: See *BICS* 36 (1989), 70-1.

508a: See *BICS* 36 (1989), 71-2.

518-48: See *BICS* 36 (1989), 67-78.

630-3

Ορ. οὔ πού τις ὅστις γνωριεῖ μ' ἰδών, γέρον;
Πρ. δμῶες μέν εἰσιν, οἵ σέ γ' οὐκ εἶδόν ποτε.
Ορ. ἡμῖν ἂν εἶεν, εἰ κρατοῖμεν, εὐμενεῖς;
Πρ. δούλων γὰρ ἴδιον τοῦτο, σοὶ δὲ σύμφορον.

631 γὰρ Paley οἵ σέ γ' Pierson: οὓς ἐγὼ L

The text of 631 as given by L is defective in meter. οὓς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἶδόν ποτε is an impossible synizesis which Triclinius wrote as an elision. The sense too is defective, for 'slaves whom I have never seen' is irrelevant to the question: we want 'slaves who have never seen you'. But Pierson's brave attempt to restore the desired sense is not signally successful. It is hard to see why Euripides would have the Old Man say 'They are, to be sure, slaves [why μέν?] who have never seen *you*': why does the emphasis imparted by γ' fall on *you* rather than *have seen*?

Also contributing to the confusions is that when Orestes has killed Aegisthus one of the slaves *does* recognize him. If we read 631 with Pierson, there would be an unexplained discrepancy between what the Old Man says and what the facts turn out to be. Carelessness? Perhaps. But we can have consistency with 852-3, a plausible use of μέν, and intelligible rhetoric by emending differently. Surely the μέν-clause originally read 'one slave can recognize you', for which plausible Greek, not far removed from the paradosis, is δμώων μὲν εἷς τις. The latter half must mean 'but the others have never seen you'. Willink suggests οἱ δέ σ' οὐκ εἶδόν ποτε. This is further from the paradosis than Pierson's conjecture, which was already a stretch. But corruption on almost any hypothesis is deep here: the ἐγὼ is perhaps a mistaken note glossing εἶδον as first person, and once this invaded, chaos ensued. We cannot feel any great certainty about the wording, but δμώων μὲν εἷς τις, οἱ δέ σ' οὐκ εἶδόν ποτε gives the sense the context requires and restores consistency with 852-3.

640-7

Ορ. καλῶς ἔλεξας. ἡ τεκοῦσα δ' ἐστὶ ποῦ;
Πρ. Ἄργει· παρέσται δ' οὖν πόσει θοίνην ἔπι.
Ορ. τί δ' οὐχ ἅμ' ἐξωρμᾶτ' ἐμὴ μήτηρ πόσει;
Πρ. ψόγον τρέμουσα δημοτῶν ἐλείπετο.
Ορ. ξυνῆχ'· ὕποπτος οὖσα γιγνώσκει πόλει.
Πρ. τοιαῦτα· μισεῖται γὰρ ἀνόσιος γυνή.
Ορ. πῶς οὖν; ἐκεῖνον τήνδε τ' ἐν ταὐτῷ κτενῶ;
Ηλ. ἐγὼ φόνον γε μητρὸς ἐξαρτύσομαι.

641 οὖν Nauck: ἐν L 646 post πῶς οὖν interrogationis notam add. Denniston

The Old Man has succeeded in forming a plan to kill Aegisthus. The new king of Argos is sacrificing oxen to the Nymphs, and Orestes and Pylades are to come along and get themselves invited to participate. Then they are to improvise according to the circumstances, finding the right moment to kill him. 'Well and good', says Orestes. 'Where is my mother?' It turns out that she is still in Argos.

Before we can emend the rest of 641, it is necessary to understand the problem that faces Orestes and Electra. With Clytaemestra still in Argos the two usurpers cannot be killed on the same spot, because Orestes must go to work at once and Clytaemestra is not yet there. This means that Clytaemestra may get wind of Aegisthus' assassination and take defensive or offensive measures against her children. This is the situation to which Electra's response in 647 is the answer.

It is imperative that this situation be clearly stated and that the audience not be distracted by the thought that Clytaemestra might come along in time to be killed along with Aegisthus. That is why 641, either as transmitted or as printed by Diggle, is so disappointing. L's reading cannot be right: 'At Argos; but she will be present at the feast in her husband', i. e. represented by him, cannot be the meaning, for no Greek speaks this way. But Nauck's δ' οὖν πόσει, printed by Diggle, is not right either, for if the essential point (δ' οὖν) the Old Man conveys is that she will be present, he does not accurately point up the dilemma we reach by 646. Denniston mentions Reiske's

ἐν τάχει, but this is even worse: if she is going to be there *soon*, both victims could well be dispatched at the same time.

The solution is to be found by looking at 642-3, where the essential information is conveyed that Clytaemestra's absence is motivated by fear of the populace. At what point does this fear cease to be a hindrance, so that she may join her husband? After dark, surely, when she can travel without being recognized. Read Weil's ἐν σκότῳ. As Denniston remarks, πόσει could have come in from the following line. Since she will not be along until after dark, some provision must be made to murder her separately from Aegisthus. Hence the necessity of Electra's ruse.

But, one might object, if she is afraid to travel by day to join her husband at a sacrifice, why does Electra suppose that she will travel by day to see her new baby? The answer, surely, is that the existence of an heir to Agamemnon—for the fictitious child is male—is a matter of more pressing urgency than the dinner following a sacrifice.

In view of the situation described above, we should reject Denniston's question-mark after πῶς οὖν in 646. Orestes has just been told that Aegisthus is in the country and Clytaemestra is in the city. It makes no sense for him to ask 'What then? Will I kill both him and her at the same place?' In view of what has been said above, L's aporetic question, 'How then can we kill them both at once?', is exactly right, indicating the precise problem the conspirators face, that their second victim may be warned of the fate of the first. To express the sense properly, however, we want the deliberative subjunctive, Cobet's κτάνω, in preference to L's κτενῶ.

646-56: See *TAPA* 117 (1987), 261-3.

671-84: See *TAPA* 117 (1987), 263-5.

784-7

Νῦν μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν χρὴ συνεστίους ὁμοῦ
θοίνης γενέσθαι· τυγχάνω δὲ βουθυτῶν
Νύμφαις· ἑῷοι δ' ἐξαναστάντες λέχους
ἐς ταὐτὸν ἥξετ'.

784 ὁμοῦ Musgrave: ἐμοὶ L

In 784, though it is possible that Euripides made Aegisthus say 'Now you must *in my house* be sharers of the feast *with me*', it seems unlikely. Either παρ' ἡμῖν or ἐμοὶ should go. Diggle adopts Musgrave's ὁμοῦ. But that duplicates the meaning of συν- in συνεστίους. Also, the dative ἐμοὶ, though not absolutely necessary, is welcome. We should consider replacing παρ' ἡμῖν. L. v. Sybel suggested μένοντας. If we assumed this as the original reading, we could explain παρ' ἡμῖν as a helpful explanatory gloss on the participle, a gloss that subsequently replaced it.

Aegisthus issues his invitation to Orestes and Pylades to stay the night and participate in the sacrifice to the Nymphs and its attendant feast. If they do that, he says, 'rising at dawn from your beds you will get to the same place'. To the same place as what? Denniston declines the obvious answer, 'to the same destination as if you had not been detained by me'. Aegisthus cannot be saying 'You will get to Olympia all the same'. Nor—Denniston's second explanation—will it be particularly persuasive to those in a hurry to be told that he will put them *on the same road* tomorrow as they are leaving today. Denniston's preferred explanation, 'It will be all the same to you', seems a trifle vague, and in the parallels he cites the phrase bears a slightly different and more nearly literal meaning.

What Aegisthus ought to mean is that if they break their journey now and resume it very early the next morning, they will make *as good speed* as if they traveled on to a later stopping-place but did not get up so early. In order to make this meaning plain, I suggest, Euripides must have written, for the somewhat otiose λέχους, the vigorous and idiomatic τάχους. The use of ἐς τοσοῦτον plus genitive is, of course, quite common in Euripides. For ἐς ταὐτὸν plus genitive, see *Tro.* 684 and 1036, and *Pho.* 458.

822-6

καὶ λαβὼν μόσχου πόδα
λευκὰς ἐγύμνου σάρκας ἐκτείνων χέρα·
θᾶσσον δὲ βύρσαν ἐξέδειρεν ἢ δρομεὺς
δισσοὺς διαύλους ἱππίους διήνυσεν,

κἀνεῖτο λαγόνας.

'He took the calf's foot and laid bare the white flesh by stretching it out with his hand. [Read Musgrave's χερί in 823: otherwise ἐκτείνων χέρα duplicates the sense of λαβών.] And he flayed off the entire hide faster than a runner could run both laps of a hippodrome, and he loosened the flanks.' That is what the lines must mean. But as transmitted we have an actual runner when we want a potential one, one who *could have* run. Read therefore διήνυσ' ἄν. There is a similar passage at *Med.* 1181-2, where time elapsed is measured by an imaginary runner, and where also the ἄν was lost and had to be restored by editors.

854-8: See *CP* 37 (1987), 139-41.

862-5 ~ 876-9

νικᾷ στεφαναφόρα κρείσσω τῶν παρ' Ἀλφειοῦ
  ῥεέθροις τελέσας
κασίγνητος σέθεν· ἀλλ' ὑπάειδε
καλλίνικον ᾠδὰν ἐμῷ χορῷ.

νῦν οἱ πάρος ἁμετέρας γαίας τυραννεύσουσι 876
  φίλοι βασιλῆς
δικαίως, τοὺς ἀδίκους καθελόντες.
ἀλλ' ἴτω ξύναυλος βοὰ χαρᾷ.

862 στεφαναφόρα . . . τῶν Weil: στεφαναφορίαν . . . τοῖς L: -ίαν . . . τᾶς Musgrave (tum ⟨αὖ⟩ 876 Beck), -ίαν κρείσσω παρ' . . . τελεσάντων Bothe (del. τοῖς) et Diggle τελέσσας Tr^2, quo accepto ῥεέθροισι Murray 876 ἁμετέρας Wecklein: -οι L βασιλῆς Seidler: -ῆες L

Two readings offered by the tradition, τελέσσας in 862 and βασιλῆες in 876, deserve careful consideration. The first may be conjectural—proposed to bring the strophe into correspondence with βασιλῆες—since it belongs to Triclinius' later set of corrections in L. But for all that it may be right. The second is probably right since it is a form scribes are unlikely to have introduced on their own. Further-

more, βασιλῆες occurs in a passage of quite similar meter at *Andr.* 1024. Diggle's conjecture in the apparatus is based on the meter of the antistrophe as transmitted in L and would be convincing except for its failure to explain the insertion of τοῖς. In fact these two readings, once we adopt Wecklein's οὐ τὰν for κρείσσω τοῖς (this gloss may originally have read κρείσσω τῆς) and Murray's ῥεέθροισι for ῥεέθροις, give good sense as well as convincing meter.

896-906: See *TAPA* 117 (1987), 265-7.

916-44

It has been realized by several scholars that Electra's speech to the dead Aegisthus has been padded out with later material. In 921-4, for example, deleted by Hartung, two things are fatally wrong:

ἴστω δ', ὅταν τις διολέσας δάμαρτά του
κρυπταῖσιν εὐναῖς εἶτ' ἀναγκασθῇ λαβεῖν,
δύστηνός ἐστιν, εἰ δοκεῖ τὸ σωφρονεῖν
ἐκεῖ μὲν αὑτὴν οὐκ ἔχειν, παρ' οἷ δ' ἔχειν.

(1) The subject of ἴστω is left unclear. Cropp translates 'A man should know', and that is what the context demands, but Aegisthus is the only available subject who has been mentioned, and he is clearly unsuitable. (2) The idea that Aegisthus was forced to take Clytaemestra as a wife is absurd in the circumstances. Also highly suspicious are lines 941-4:

ἡ γὰρ φύσις βέβαιος, οὐ τὰ χρήματα.
ἡ μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ παραμένουσ' αἴρει κακά·
ὁ δ' ὄλβος ἀδίκως καὶ μετὰ σκαιῶν ξυνὼν
ἐξέπτατ' οἴκων, σμικρὸν ἀνθήσας χρόνον.

These lines, excised by Bruhn, are a piece of sententious generality that, as its quotation in Stobaeus and Sextus Empiricus shows, was attached to the *Phoenissae* in one text and is no more at home in one place than in another. Is anything else spurious?

It would help if we could see the ground-plan of the speech. As it is now, the material is exceedingly various. In some cases Aegisthus is upbraided for crimes or wrongs against others; at other times he is reproached for being pitiable. Now it is theoretically possible that Euripides gave Electra a speech that shows a jumble of ill-sorted criticisms presented in no particular order, but his usual style, as Dale points out (*Alcestis*, pp. xxvii-xxix) is to act as a good *logographos* to his characters. This general expectation, derived from his practice elsewhere, is heightened when we read Electra's proem (907-13) promising a speech that has been thought out long before this and polished in the small hours of the morning.

We might begin at the end, 952-6, which is, in my view, certainly genuine and may give us at least the basic plan of the whole. But before we can use it, we must restore the wording.

> ἔρρ’, οὐδὲν εἰδὼς ὧν ἐφευρεθεὶς χρόνῳ
> δίκην δέδωκας. ὧδέ τις κακοῦργος ὢν
> μή μοι τὸ πρῶτον βῆμ’ ἐὰν δράμῃ καλῶς
> νικᾶν δοκείτω τὴν Δίκην, πρὶν ἂν πέρας
> γραμμῆς ἵκηται καὶ τέλος κάμψῃ βίου.

As transmitted in L and printed by Diggle, 952-3 mean 'Be gone, not knowing any of the crimes for which, unmasked by Time, you have paid the penalty'. This cannot be right, for Aegisthus knew his own crimes perfectly well. Denniston suggests that he didn't know the penalty that his crimes incurred, i. e. that he didn't know what hit him, and that we should accordingly read Walberg's (actually Bothe's) ὡς for ὧν. It is true that Aegisthus, his spine broken by a sharp blow from behind with a heavy cleaver, may not have had sufficient time in this life to work out that he was paying the penalty for his earlier crimes. But the whole point of taxing him now—as with Aegisthus' own insults to the dead Agamemnon reported in 330-1—is that the dead man addressed still exists and is conscious both of his past and of what is being said to him now. The supposition that there is no longer any conscious being corresponding to the name Aegisthus would deprive the present exercise of any point.

If we did not have to deal with a relative pronoun, it would make perfect sense to take ἐφευρεθεὶς χρόνῳ δίκην δέδωκας as an inde-

pendent sentence, 'detected by Time, you have paid the penalty'. The relative disappears if we adopt Radermacher's elegant conjecture ἔρρ', οὐδὲν εἰδὼς ⟨σ⟩ῶν: 'Be off, man of unsound thoughts!'

Electra's peroration, therefore, says that Aegisthus' thoughts were unsound, that he has committed crimes, and that he has paid the penalty for them. The latter point is also made by the Chorus's two-line intervention, 957-8. Let us see what parts of the speech fit in with this general theme and which do not.

After the proem, announcing a polished speech, come 914-20, lines that start in promising fashion but end rather disappointingly.

> ἀπώλεσάς με κὠρφανὴν φίλου πατρὸς
> καὶ τόνδ' ἔθηκας, οὐδὲν ἠδικημένος,
> κἄγημας αἰσχρῶς μητέρ' ἄνδρα τ' ἔκτανες
> στρατηλατοῦνθ' Ἕλλησιν, οὐκ ἐλθὼν Φρύγας.
> ἐς τοῦτο δ' ἦλθες ἀμαθίας ὥστ' ἤλπισας
> ὡς ἐς σὲ μὲν δὴ μητέρ' οὐχ ἕξοις κακὴν
> γήμας, ἐμοῦ δὲ πατρὸς ἠδίκει λέχη.

There is no problem about a sentence such as ἀπώλεσάς με κὠρφανὴν φίλου πατρὸς ἔθηκας: 'you destroyed me and caused me to be bereft of my dear father'. The με is expressed with the first verb and easily supplied with the second. But things get rather difficult when in the second clause you have a καὶ which connects τόνδε with a pronoun that has to be supplied out of the first clause ('you destroyed me and made (me) and him bereft of a dear father'). This is made even worse when the word 'bereft' is feminine. I can only appeal to my reader's *Stilgefühl*: mine tells me that this is impossible syntax. We might write τοῦδε for τόνδε: Aegisthus bereft Electra not only of her father but also of her brother. We know from the prologue that he put a price on Orestes' head. Though this joins dissimilar cases, the loss of a father through death and the loss of a brother by exile, it remains an inexpensive remedy.

More expensive, but giving value for money, is the supposition of a lacuna after 914. Consider the facts. The chief items in any indictment of Aegisthus should be the murder of Agamemnon, the attempted murder of Orestes, on whose head Aegisthus put a price, and the marriage of Electra to a man below her station. The first is men-

tioned here glancingly and in 916, on which see below. The second and third are noticed nowhere in the speech. Electra begins by speaking of Aegisthus' crimes against her (914-5). Perhaps her speech once continued as follows: 'You have destroyed my life and bereft me of my father, <for you murdered him treacherously with the help of his wife. But that was not enough for you: when I came of age you gave me in marriage to this poor laborer, and you promised a rich reward for the murder of Orestes. Both me> and him you have caused <to be deprived of our paternal home> though we had done you no wrong.' (The illustrative supplement printed below shows how grammar and sense are restored by this supposition.) Electra starts by establishing the most pertinent of the objective facts before moving on to anything of a more evaluative nature.

I punctuate with a period at the end of 915 and bracket 916-7, for these lines are weak stuff, and it is hard to see why no one has challenged them before. 'You married my mother shamefully and you killed the man [or her husband] who was general of the Greeks, though you did not go to Troy.' In the pairing of shameful marriage and murder, the former occupies the lead position to which the latter is entitled on grounds both of chronology (unless ἔγημας is a euphemism for 'seduced') and intrinsic importance. Then μητέρ' (which has to mean 'my mother') jostles oddly with ἄνδρα (which could be 'her husband' or simply 'the man'). Then there is the handling of participles in 917, where the accusative participle is (apparently) attributive and the nominative is circumstantial, with the appearance of complementarity to aggravate the dissonance.

The predominance of sexual misdeeds over murder seen in 916 continues to be felt as we move on to 918-20. There Electra says that Aegisthus was a poor fool for believing that Clytaemestra, who had been unfaithful to Agamemnon, would be faithful to him. The idea that the wife who has deceived her husband with her lover may in turn deceive the lover now that he is her husband is the theme of 921-4, deleted by Hartung on strong grounds (see above). Since all seven lines elaborate the same theme and are a continuous passage, they should probably stand or fall together.

Style tells the same story. Although 918 starts off in a passable imitation of Euripides' manner, 919-20 fall off disastrously. Canter's ἠδίκει is clearly right, yet of the two clauses that follow ἤλπισας,

one is future and the other is past, and the second ought to have been in subordination to, not coordination with, the first. To make Hartung's deletion of 921-4 even more secure, note that Euripides does not elsewhere use the form οἷ.[1] The whole passage, 916-24, should go.

With 925-9 we hit upon lines that we may reasonably suppose to have been written by Euripides.

> ἄλγιστα δ' ᾤκεις, οὐ δοκῶν οἰκεῖν κακῶς·
> ᾔδησθα γὰρ δῆτ' ἀνόσιον γήμας γάμον,
> μήτηρ δὲ σ' ἄνδρα δυσσεβῆ κεκτημένη.
> ἄμφω πονηρὼ δ' ὄντ' ἀνῃρεῖσθον τύχην
> κείνη τε τὴν σὴν καὶ σὺ τοὐκείνης κακόν.

'Your life was a misery, though others thought you were not living badly. You knew that the marriage you had made was an impious one, and my mother knew that in you she had a godless husband.' This is the only passage in the speech that portrays Aegisthus as miserable and contemptible and does not also betray itself as an interpolation by strained syntax or un-tragic vocabulary. Note, however, that Aegisthus' misery is here directly connected with his impiety. Electra does not talk about irrelevant social stigmas or the possibility that Clytaemestra may be unfaithful to her new husband as she was to her old. Instead she describes Aegisthus as an impious man married to an impious woman. This is not irrelevant to the general theme of the speech, that Aegisthus' criminal behavior has finally been punished.

The next pair of lines end rather awkwardly: having begun ἀνῃρεῖσθον τύχην, κείνη τε τὴν σὴν καὶ σὺ we expect τὴν κείνης. Instead we get τοὐκείνης κακόν, with its pointless insertion of κακόν where nothing at all is needed to make the sense plain. Here, however, corruption is a better bet than interpolation. Read κείνη τε τοῦ σοῦ καὶ σὺ τοὐκείνης κακοῦ: 'Both of you were wicked, and each

---

[1] Allen and Italie s.v. οἷ list our passage and the *lectio incerta* οὗ at *Tro*. 704. Both Hermann and Badham conjectured the pronoun at *Andr*. 53.

took upon himself the fate of the other's wickedness, she yours and you hers.'[1]

πᾶσιν δ' ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἤκουες τάδε·
Ὁ τῆς γυναικός, οὐχὶ τἀνδρὸς ἡ γυνή.
καίτοι τόδ' αἰσχρόν, προστατεῖν γε δωμάτων
γυναῖκα, μὴ τὸν ἄνδρα· κἀκείνους στυγῶ
τοὺς παῖδας, ὅστις τοῦ μὲν ἄρσενος πατρὸς
οὐκ ὠνόμασται, τῆς δὲ μητρὸς ἐν πόλει.
ἐπίσημα γὰρ γήμαντι καὶ μείζω λέχη
τἀνδρὸς μὲν οὐδείς, τῶν δὲ θηλειῶν λόγος.

932-7 were suspected by Wecklein. There is no particular reason why Aegisthus, who, as the son of Thyestes, has a claim on the throne himself, should be obviously inferior in birth to his new wife or why she should seem the one in command of the house. Nothing else in the play suggests that Aegisthus was not master in his own house. In spite of his wife's maternal sentiments he puts a price on Orestes' head. It is true that he does not kill Electra, but the fact that he marries her to the Autourgos need not betoken any lack of authority in his own house. But if this consideration casts doubt on 932-7, 930-1 ought to go too. 931 is a specimen of the same kind of clumsy writing about the reciprocal relations between the sexes that we see in *Andr*. 668-77 (note especially 672-4).

The next passage, as noted above, contains at least one foreign body, 941-4.

ὃ δ' ἠπάτα σε πλεῖστον οὐκ ἐγνωκότα,
ηὔχεις τις εἶναι τοῖσι χρήμασι σθένων·
τὰ δ' οὐδὲν εἰ μὴ βραχὺν ὁμιλῆσαι χρόνον.
ἡ γὰρ φύσις βέβαιος, οὐ τὰ χρήματα.
ἡ μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ παραμένουσ' αἴρει κακά·
ὁ δ' ὄλβος ἀδίκως καὶ μετὰ σκαιῶν ξυνὼν
ἐξέπτατ' οἴκων, σμικρὸν ἀνθήσας χρόνον.
ἃ δ' ἐς γυναῖκας (παρθένῳ γὰρ οὐ καλὸν
λέγειν) σιωπῶ, γνωρίμως δ' αἰνίξομαι·

---

[1] Weil proposed κείνη τε τῶν σῶν καὶ σὺ τῶν κείνης κακῶν, but τὰ κακά are 'troubles', while the context here calls for 'baseness' or 'wickedness'.

ὕβριζες, ὡς δὴ βασιλικοὺς ἔχων δόμους
κάλλει τ' ἀραρώς. ἀλλ' ἔμοιγ' εἴη πόσις
μὴ παρθενωπὸς ἀλλὰ τἀνδρείου τρόπου.
τὰ γὰρ τέκν' αὐτῶν Ἄρεος ἐκκρεμάννυται,
τὰ δ' εὐπρεπῆ δὴ κόσμος ἐν χοροῖς μόνον.

Lines 938-40 are without any problems, and they are highly relevant to the theme of Aegisthus' unsound thoughts. Thereafter someone has added a little essay on a related but not quite relevant topic, the relative merits of character and money. It was correctly deleted by Bruhn.

One can be of two minds about 945-51. On the one hand Aegisthus' treatment of women exhibits the confidence born of power and therefore shows the unsoundness of his thinking. On the other hand, is it really relevant that Aegisthus is good looking? Nothing is said about his looks anywhere else in the play. What relevance is it that Electra herself would prefer to have a manly, not a maiden-faced, husband? Why does it matter what sort of children are born to the maiden-faced or that the maiden-faced are good only for adorning a chorus? Lines 386-90, a passage there are adequate reasons for bracketing, show a similar mode of expression.

Electra's 50-line speech has now shrunk considerably. Several lines may have been lost in the accidental lacuna I diagnose at 914. And it is not at all incredible that in the process of such extensive tampering other genuine lines may have been omitted. But to show that all these excisions are not impossible, I print what remains, together with an illustrative supplement for the lacuna I mark after 914. Note that in the underlined words I have provided an explanation for the accidental loss.

εἶέν· τίν' ἀρχὴν πρῶτά σ' ἐξείπω κακῶν,
ποίας τελευτάς; τίνα μέσον τάξω λόγον;
καὶ μὴν δι' ὄρθρων γ' οὔποτ' ἐξελίμπανον
θρυλοῦσ' ἅ γ' εἰπεῖν ἤθελον κατ' ὄμμα σόν,
εἰ δὴ γενοίμην δειμάτων ἐλευθέρα
τῶν πρόσθε. νῦν οὖν ἐσμεν· ἀποδώσω δέ σοι
ἐκεῖν' ἅ σε ζῶντ' ἤθελον λέξαι κακά.
   ἀπώλεσάς με κὠρφανὴν φίλου πατρὸς

⟨αἰσχρῶς <u>ἔθηκας</u> · ὅν γ' ἄφαρκτον ἐκ λόχου
ἔκτεινας, ἔργου δ' ἦν σύνεργός σοι γυνή.
κοὐκ ἤρκεσεν ταῦτ', ἀλλ' ἐπεί μ' ὥρα γάμου
εἶχ', ἐξέδωκας εὐγενῶν μὲν οὐδενί,
χέρνητι δ' ἀνδρὶ τῷδε, θανάσιμον γάμον,
φυγάδα δ' Ὀρέστην ἐξεκήρυξας κτανεῖν,
τὸν δὲ κτανόντα δυσσεβῶς χρυσὸν πολὺν
λαβεῖν · πατρῴων κἀμὲ τητᾶσθαι δόμων⟩
καὶ τόνδ' <u>ἔθηκας</u>, οὐδὲν ἠδικημένος.
ἄλγιστα δ' ᾤκεις, οὐ δοκῶν οἰκεῖν κακῶς ·
ᾔδησθα γὰρ δῆτ' ἀνόσιον γήμας γάμον,
μήτηρ δὲ σ' ἄνδρα δυσσεβῆ κεκτημένη.
ἄμφω πονηρὼ δ' ὄντ' ἀνῃρεῖσθον τύχην
κείνη τε τοῦ σοῦ καὶ σὺ τοῦ κείνης κακοῦ.
ὃ δ' ἠπάτα σε πλεῖστον οὐκ ἐγνωκότα,
ηὔχεις τις εἶναι τοῖσι χρήμασι σθένων ·
τὰ δ' οὐδὲν εἰ μὴ βραχὺν ὁμιλῆσαι χρόνον.
ἔρρ', οὐδὲν εἰδὼς σῶν · ἐφευρεθεὶς χρόνῳ
δίκην δέδωκας. ὧδέ τις κακοῦργος ὢν
μή μοι τὸ πρῶτον βῆμ' ἐὰν δράμῃ καλῶς,
νικᾶν δοκείτω τὴν Δίκην, πρὶν ἂν πέρας
γραμμῆς ἵκηται καὶ τέλος κάμψῃ βίου.

959-70: See *AJP* 105(1984), 239.

973

ὅστις μ' ἔχρησας μητέρ', ἣν οὐ χρῆν, κτανεῖν.

Surely Orestes says, 'His oracle was that I should kill my mother, whom it is not right to kill' rather than 'whom I ought not to be killing [but am]'. The present χρή has been replaced by the imperfect (ἐ)χρῆν, with its unwanted overtones of unfulfilled obligation, as has happened many times in the corpus of Euripides.

985-7

ἔσειμι· δεινοῦ δ' ἄρχομαι προβήματος,
καὶ δεινὰ δράσω γ'. εἰ θεοῖς δοκεῖ τάδε,
ἔστω· πικρὸν δ' οὐχ ἡδὺ τἀγώνισμά μοι.

985 προβήματος Denniston (noluit Camper): προβλ- L 986 γ' add. Tr[1]: om. L

Diggle prints Denniston's προβήματος in 985, but M. L. West, *BICS* 27 (1980), 14, defends προβλήματος, which he interprets as from προβάλλεσθαι, the sprinkling of the victim with barley-corns at the beginning of a sacrifice.

The γ' in 986 might have manuscript authority since it belongs to the first set of Triclinius' alterations in L, and for at least some of these alterations he apparently had manuscript evidence. But it is a little difficult to see why we want this emphasis to fall on δράσω. The most natural suspicion is that γε has been inserted to avoid hiatus. Troubling too is the asyndeton in the next sentence. We expect 'terrible is the sacrificial rite I am beginning and terrible the deeds I shall do, *but* if it is the gods' will, so be it'.

There is a simple way to avoid the hiatus and to supply the connective we want, Weil's θεοῖσι δ' εἰ. Altering hyperbatic word-order to that of normal prose is a scribal habit that we find in countless places. And scribes leave out connectives where they are wanted and put them in where they are not times without number. Read καὶ δεινὰ δράσω. θεοῖσι δ' εἰ δοκεῖ τάδε, / ἔστω.

1013-7

λέξω δέ· καίτοι δόξ' ὅταν λάβῃ κακὴ
γυναῖκα, γλώσσῃ πικρότης ἔνεστί τις·
ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν, οὐ κακῶς· τὸ πρᾶγμα δὲ
μαθόντας, ἢν μὲν ἀξίως μισεῖν ἔχῃ,
στυγεῖν δίκαιον· εἰ δὲ μή, τί δεῖ στυγεῖν;

1015 κακῶς Diggle: καλῶς L, quo servato ὑμῖν Bothe 1016 μαθόντας Reiske: -όντα σ' L ἔχῃ Bothe: ἔχῃς L

There is only one way, as far as I can see, for Clytaemestra's proem to make rhetorical sense: retain the reading of L in 1015, ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν οὐ καλῶς and interpret with Seidler. And there is only one objection to this, an objection that can be met.

Lines 1013-7 are a familiar rhetorical gambit, a complaint by the speaker that he or she is laboring under prejudice and an appeal to the audience to learn the facts before reaching a verdict. The point of τὸ πρᾶγμα δὲ . . . στυγεῖν is that when the facts are known, if they justify hatred, then one should hate, if not, then not. And the point of what precedes is that when a bad reputation seizes a woman, she labors under prejudice, and people hate her without troubling to learn the facts. Seidler translates γλώσσῃ πικρότης ἔνεστί τις as 'orationi eius invisi quid inest (i. e. eius orationem inviti audiunt, neque aequa lance pendunt)'. This accords with a very frequent use of πικρός as 'unwelcome, distasteful' (cf. LSJ s.v. III.2 and *Cycl.* 528, *Med.* 224, *Hec.* 1277, *Su.* 1222, *El.* 638, *Hel.* 296-7, *Pho.* 956 with Mastronarde's note, etc.) and allows us to translate 'Well, I shall speak. Yet when evil repute takes a woman as its prey, what she says is unwelcome to her hearers, most unfairly, in my judgment: for though it is proper to hate when one has learned the facts and hating is justified, when that is not the case, why hate her?' Diggle's interpretation, which necessitates changing οὐ καλῶς to οὐ κακῶς, is justly criticized by Cropp, *LCM* 7 (1982), 53.

Denniston objects to Seidler's interpretation on the grounds that 'ἔνεστι strongly suggests that πικρότης is a quality residing in the tongue', and Diggle, *ICS* 2 (1977), 120 (=*Euripidea* 164), says 'This is not so much strongly suggested as certain'. But some qualities can be described either objectively or subjectively, either as inhering in a thing or a person or as calling forth a certain reaction in others. If Eupolis says of Pericles πειθώ τις ἐπεκάθιζεν ἐπὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν, this describes the reaction of Pericles' audience to him with words that appear to make a certain quality objectively inherent in Pericles' organs of speech. Likewise, if 'a certain quality of unwelcomeness' resides in the tongue of a maligned woman, that is a plausible way of describing the reaction of others to her speech. There is no need for Diggle's emendation or for Matthiae's far-fetched suggestion, treated too respectfully by Cropp, that the tongue is that of the woman's detractor.

1030-48

ἐπὶ τοῖσδε τοίνυν καίπερ ἠδικημένη
οὐκ ἠγριώμην οὐδ' ἂν ἔκτανον πόσιν.
ἀλλ' ἦλθ' ἔχων μοι μαινάδ' ἔνθεον κόρην
λέκτροις τ' ἐπεισέφρηκε, καὶ νύμφα δύο
ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς δώμασιν κατεῖχ' ὁμοῦ.
μῶρον μὲν οὖν γυναῖκες, οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω·
ὅταν δ', ὑπόντος τοῦδ', ἁμαρτάνῃ πόσις
τἄνδον παρώσας λέκτρα, μιμεῖσθαι θέλει
γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα χἄτερον κτᾶσθαι φίλον.
κἄπειτ' ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ ψόγος λαμπρύνεται,
οἱ δ' αἴτιοι τῶνδ' οὐ κλύουσ' ἄνδρες κακῶς.
εἰ δ' ἐκ δόμων ἥρπαστο Μενέλεως λάθρᾳ,
κτανεῖν μ' Ὀρέστην χρῆν, κασιγνήτης πόσιν
Μενέλαον ὡς σώσαιμι; σὸς δὲ πῶς πατὴρ
ἠνέσχετ' ἂν ταῦτ'; εἶτα τὸν μὲν οὐ θανεῖν
κτείνοντα χρῆν τἄμ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου παθεῖν
⟨ ⟩;
ἔκτειν', ἐτρέφθην ᾗπερ ἦν πορεύσιμον
πρὸς τοὺς ἐκείνῳ πολεμίους. φίλων γὰρ ἂν
τίς ἂν φόνου σοῦ πατρὸς ἐκοινώνησέ μοι;

1030-40 del. Vitelli   1033 ἐπεισέφρησε Dawes: cf. Herc. 1267   1034 κατεῖχ' ὁμοῦ Dawes: κατείχομεν L   1045 post h. v. lac. indic. Diggle, e. g. ⟨κτείνουσαν αὐτοῦ παῖδας οὐκ ἐλάσσονα⟩

Denniston's discussion, pp. 177-8, gives the essentials. The chief problem addressed by Vitelli's deletion of 1030-40 is that 1018-29 discuss Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia, 1030-40 his installation of his mistress, Cassandra, in the palace at Argos, and then 1041-5 return to the subject of Iphigenia, an awkward and meandering arrangement of the material. The join between 1040 (the end of the Cassandra passage) and 1041 is also rather abrupt, and Denniston indicates that something stronger than δέ would have been expected. Vitelli's deletion puts the two Iphigenia passages together. It is also to be noticed that the Cassandra passage is not answered or alluded to in Electra's speech in reply, further indication, one might suppose, that it is not original. Denniston notes that there is nothing un-Euri-

pidean about the language of 1030-40 and that they are unlikely to be from another Euripidean play. He suggests that they may have been added at a later stage by Euripides himself, who may have neglected to harmonize them with their surroundings.

The alternative is Wilamowitz' deletion of 1041-5.[1] Denniston admits that 'the supposition of a war waged to recover an abducted husband . . . is certainly grotesque'. But he objects that the asyndeton at 1046 (ἔκτειν') is very harsh after 1040, as was recognized by Wilamowitz, who proposed ἐκ τῶνδ'. After 1045, he claims, the asyndeton seems wholly appropriate.

I was at first inclined to accept Vitelli's deletion. But I am now convinced that Wilamowitz's deletion of 1041-5 is far superior. Let me set out my own defense of 1030-40 and my attack on 1041-5 before dealing with the problem of the asyndeton in 1046.

To put it simply, the quality of writing in 1030-40 is very high indeed, and there are several touches that hit to perfection the Euripidean style. φρέω is an old Attic verb no interpolator is likely to have used (see Barrett on *Hi.* 866-7), and Euripides several places uses its compounds (see the passages cited by Barrett). In 1037 παρώσας used of a man 'displacing' his former mate: cf. *Andr.* 30 τοὐμὸν παρώσας δεσπότης δοῦλον λέχος. The use of a participial phrase like ὑπόντος τοῦδε to recapitulate in the δέ-clause a point made in the μέν-clause is typical of both Sophocles and Euripides, as I argue in a forthcoming article on *Tro.* 95-7. And the use of κἄπειτα, κᾆτα or εἶτα for a climactic indignant question or assertion is typical: see *Alc.* 701, *Andr.* 600, 605, 666, etc. The lines *could*, as Denniston suggests, have been a subsequent addition by Euripides. But that is a hypothesis better kept in reserve for truly desperate cases.

The brief against 1041-5 is not absolutely compelling, it must be admitted, but to me they read like the work of an interpolator. First of all, the supposition, as Denniston notes, is bizarre: Menelaus abducted from his house (and λάθρᾳ, 'by stealth', to boot), and Clytaemestra killing Orestes in order to 'save' her sister's husband (σώσαιμι an oddly chosen word). Then the application to the situation at hand is somewhat backhanded: 'How would your father have stood for that? Then [the author has got on to a Euripidean trick here] can

[1] *Hermes* 18 (1883), 223 (=*KS* iv.169-70).

you claim that it was wrong for him to be killed for killing my children, yet right for me to suffer at his hands?' The point of ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου παθεῖν, that it would have been right for Agamemnon to punish her for the murder of Orestes, has been only obliquely established in what preceded by question σὸς δὲ πῶς πατὴρ / ἠνέσχετ' ἂν ταῦτ'. And it is a bit odd that this hypothetical case, which forms the justification for killing Agamemnon, is put second rather than first.[1] This part of the speech, besides needlessly repeating the same point about the death of Iphigenia, is nowhere near as good as the lawyer-like treatment Clytaemestra gives this theme in 1018-29.

Now we come to the problem of the asyndeton in 1046, the chief difficulty Denniston raises against Wilamowitz's deletion of 1041-5. We should note that there are two asyndeta: not only is the connection with 1040 or 1045 asyndetic but so also that between ἔκτειν' and ἐτρέφθην. The second is as troubling as the first, for when two verbs are joined asyndetically at the beginning of the line, we expect them to be roughly synonymous: cf. *Andr.* 1154 βάλλων ἀράσσων, *Hec.* 1044 ἄρασσε, φείδου μηδέν, and other examples in Mastronarde's note on *Pho.* 1193, Collard's note on *Su.* 699-700a, and literature cited by both. 'I killed, I turned where I could' looks implausible in light of these passages, for killing and turning to enemies for help are not synonymous or even nearly synonymous, the second being purely instrumental to the first. This strongly suggests that something is missing before ἔκτειν', and in fact Diggle puts a lacuna after 1045. It may have contained not only the words implied by the possibly incomplete 1045 (see Diggle's apparatus above)[2] but also those required by the almost certainly incomplete 1046, e. g.

> ⟨τάχ' οὖν ἂν εἴποις ὡς σὺν ἀνδρὶ δυσμενεῖ⟩
> ἔκτειν'· ἐτρέφθην ᾗπερ ἦν πορεύσιμον
> πρὸς τοὺς ἐκείνῳ πολεμίους.

---

[1] M. Cropp, *LCM* 7 (1982), 51-2, cites *Andr.* 663-7 as a parallel for this proceeding, but the parallel is inexact, and one need not translate the passage as Cropp does: see my Loeb vol. ii, p. 335.

[2] This is possibly unnecessary: Cropp makes a good case for παθεῖν used absolutely here.

ἔκτειν' is thus part of the preceding sentence, which is a rhetorical *prolepsis*, and ἐτρέφθην (naturally in asyndeton) begins the reply.[1] The problem of asyndeton between 1040 and 1046 is thus addressed, and Denniston's *Stilgefühl*, which told him so clearly that 1030-40 were by Euripides, can be accorded its full weight but without the hypothesis of authorial second thoughts.

As regards the absence of a reply to 1030-40 in Electra's speech, that is not so surprising. Electra has chosen to give her speech an entirely different structure from that of her mother's, choosing to emphasize Clytaemestra's similarity to Helen. She says nothing about installing Cassandra as a second wife in the palace (a difficult point to reply to as such behavior would be much harder to defend than casual infidelity away from home), but she likewise says nothing in reply to Clytaemestra's words about turning to Agamemnon's enemies. In order to show what results from Wilamowitz' deletion, I print the affected portion.

> μῶρον μὲν οὖν γυναῖκες, οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω·
> ὅταν δ', ὑπόντος τοῦδ', ἁμαρτάνῃ πόσις
> τἄνδον παρώσας λέκτρα, μιμεῖσθαι θέλει
> γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα χἄτερον κτᾶσθαι φίλον.
> κἄπειτ' ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ ψόγος λαμπρύνεται,
> οἱ δ' αἴτιοι τῶνδ' οὐ κλύουσ' ἄνδρες κακῶς;
> 〈τάχ' οὖν ἂν εἴποις ὡς σὺν ἀνδρὶ δυσμενεῖ〉
> ἔκτειν'. ἐτρέφθην ἥνπερ[2] ἦν πορεύσιμον
> πρὸς τοὺς ἐκείνῳ πολεμίους. φίλων γὰρ ἂν
> τίς ἂν φόνου σοῦ πατρὸς ἐκοινώνησέ μοι;
> λέγ' εἴ τι χρῄζεις, κτλ.

1058-9

> Ηλ. ἆρ' ἂν κλύουσα, μῆτερ, εἶτ' ἔρξαις κακῶς;
> Κλ. †οὐκ ἔστι, τῇ σῇ δ' ἡδὺ προσθήσω φρενί†.

---

[1] For hypothetical objection followed (in asyndeton) by the reply, see *Su.* 184-6. For a sentence ending after the second element of the trimeter, with the next sentence in asyndeton, cf. *Su.* 396-7.

[2] I have ventured to keep ἥνπερ, the reading of L, in preference to Boissonade's ᾗπερ: see Barrett on *Hip.* 571-4.

1059 οὔκ· εἴ τι σῇ τῇδ' Jackson, οὔκ, εἴ τι τῇ σῇ γ' Lloyd-Jones, οὔκ· εἴ τι τῇ σῇ δ' Diggle dubitanter

Sense is restored to this passage not by the intuition, attractive in itself but not ultimately fruitful, that ἔστι conceals εἴ τι, and that the sense is 'No, not if I am going to add something sweet to your mind'[1], but by Weil's simple expedient of changing προσθήσω to προσθέσθαι: οὐκ ἔστι, τῇ σῇ δ' ἡδὺ προσθέσθαι φρενί: 'Not so: it is a pleasure to fall in with, accede to, your way of thinking.'

1172-4

> ἀλλ' οἴδε μητρὸς νεοφόνοις ἐν αἵμασιν
> πεφυρμένοι βαίνουσιν ἐξ οἴκων πόδα.
> ⟨ ⟩
> τροπαῖα, δείγματ' ἀθλίων προσφαγμάτων.

1173 post h. v. lac. indic. Paley 1174 τροπαῖα Reiske: τρόπαια L προσφαγμάτων Musgrave: προσφθεγ- L

Paley was right to mark a lacuna after 1173. What once stood there? It is apparent from 1227ff. that the body of Clytaemestra is on stage, possibly with that of Aegisthus, since Orestes tells Electra to cover it up and Electra says that she is doing so. But this implies that the bodies have been rolled out on the eccyclema. By the principle we might call Taplin's Law[2], any significant stage-action is mirrored in the text, and at precisely the point where we have a lacuna, we expect an announcement that the body of Clytaemestra, with perhaps also that of Aegisthus, becomes visible.

Diggle's 1174 is not very satisfactory. He has introduced two changes, the change of accent on τρόπαια, making it an adjective, and Musgrave's προσφαγμάτων for L's προσφθεγμάτων. The result is hard to translate: the best I can manage is '< . . . . > connected with a rout, demonstrations of wretched sacrifices'.

Without the line before it to give us context we are not in a very good position to emend the line we have. In fact we need not emend

---

[1] And why, incidentally, is the minatory future condition appropriate?

[2] See O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 28-31.

(except trivially) and can save all the letters transmitted if we use some care in filling the lacuna. My *exempli gratia* supplement is as follows:

ἀλλ' οἵδε μητρὸς νεοφόνοις ἐν αἵμασιν
πεφυρμένοι βαίνουσιν ἐξ οἴκων πόδα.
⟨καὶ μὴν ἐν αὐταῖς δὴ πυλαῖς νεκροὺς ὁρῶ
τῶν πρὶν τυράννων, δυσφιλεστάτης μάχης⟩
τρόπαια δεῖγμά τ' ἀθλίων προσφθεγμάτων.

'<But look, in the very doors I see the corpses of those who once ruled,> trophies <of an unlovely struggle> and clear proof of the meaning of those piteous words.'

1292-1307: See *CQ* 35 (1985), 310-4.

44-8

> ἐγὼ δέ (λείπει γάρ με τοῖσδ' ἐν δώμασιν
> τροφὸν τέκνων οἰκουρόν, ἡνίκα χθονὸς
> μέλαιναν ὄρφνην εἰσέβαινε, παῖς ἐμός)
> σὺν μητρί, τέκνα μὴ θάνωσ' Ἡρακλέους,
> βωμὸν καθίζω τόνδε σωτῆρος Διός, κτλ.

Bond describes the problem here. As punctuated by Murray and Diggle, Amphitryon says that he and Megara are sitting at the altar of Zeus (no mention of the children) in order that Heracles' children (no mention of Megara or himself) may not be killed , when in actuality all the persons mentioned are sitting at the altar and all do so in order to avoid being killed. Wilamowitz, leaving out the comma, takes σὺν μητρί with τέκνα as, in effect, a second subject to θάνωσι, but that is not much better: now Amphitryon alone, it is implied, is sitting at the altar so that the others may not be killed.

We can do better than that if we note that καθίζω may be transitive as well as intransitive, thereby allowing Amphitryon to say that he is seating *Megara and the children* at the altar so that they will not be killed:

> σὺν μητρὶ τέκνα, μὴ θάνωσ', Ἡρακλέους
> βωμὸν καθίζω ⟨'ς⟩ τόνδε σωτῆρος Διός, κτλ.

'I, to prevent their death, have set Heracles' children with their mother at the altar of Zeus the Savior here.' The object of καθίζω is σὺν μητρὶ τέκνα Ἡρακλέους and its second object is βωμόν. Intransitive καθίζω can take an accusative of the place where one sits, but since I have not found an instance with transitive καθίζω, I read βωμὸν καθίζω ⟨'ς⟩ τόνδε. The sons and their mother are now involved in the act of sitting and the safety of all of them is in view. It is entirely natural and in character that Amphitryon does not mention his own suppliancy or the danger to his life: in 36-42 his own danger is a kind of afterthought.

60-70

ὦ πρέσβυ, Ταφίων ὅς ποτ' ἐξεῖλες πόλιν
στρατηλατήσας κλεινὰ Καδμείων δορός,
ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώποισι τῶν θείων σαφές.
ἐγὼ γὰρ οὔτ' ἐς πατέρ' ἀπηλάθην τύχης,
ὃς οὕνεκ' ὄλβου μέγας ἐκομπάσθη ποτὲ
ἔχων τυραννίδ', ἧς μακραὶ λόγχαι πέρι
πηδῶσ' ἔρωτι σώματ' εἰς εὐδαίμονα,
ἔχων δὲ τέκνα· κἄμ' ἔδωκε παιδὶ σῷ,
ἐπίσημον εὐνὴν Ἡρακλεῖ συνοικίσας.
καὶ νῦν ἐκεῖνα μὲν θανόντ' ἀνέπτατο,
ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ σὺ μέλλομεν θνῄσκειν, γέρον, κτλ.

65-6 suspectos habet Diggle (deletis his vv. τε pro δὲ 67 scribendum est)

In order to make up our minds about the wording at 63 and the genuineness of 65-6, we need to be clear about the general sense of Megara's argument. I give here what I think is the outline, indicating doubts and other possibilities by means of footnotes.

(1) What the gods send is always uncertain.

(2) To take my case, my father was blessed [in kingship and][1] in children.

(3) He was also blessed in marrying me to Heracles, a match that brought honor to him and me.[2]

(4) But now all the other aspects of my blessedness have fled away and I am also about to lose my life.

There are several reasons to be suspicious about 63. (a) οὔτε . . . καί is very rare, and Denniston, *GP* 505, can cite only one example

[1] This gives the sense of 65-6, which Diggle is inclined to delete.

[2] The fact that the verbs ἐκομπάσθη and ἔδωκε have the same subject tells against interpreting this as 'I was blessed in my husband', parallel to 'I was blessed in my father'. Rather, it is part of Creon's good fortune: his daughter was already 'a splendid match', ἐπίσημον εὐνήν, and in marrying her to Heracles he does her and himself justice. The point here is nearly the same one that Amphitryon made in 10-2: Megara was celebrated as a bride when Heracles married her. Wilamowitz takes ἐπίσημον εὐνὴν in apposition to the verbal idea, as at 59. The following participle, though redundant, is not hopelessly so: 'He gave me as bride to your son, which was a glorious match since he married her to *Heracles*'.

from poetry, *IT* 591-2, and this he explains as a change of construction: in εἶ γάρ, ὡς ἔοικας, οὔτε δυσγενὴς / καὶ τὰς Μυκήνας οἶσθα, the change is from the expected οὔτ' ἄιδρις to a positive expression.[1] He does not discuss our passage, but it seems unlikely that he would have adopted the same measures here: nothing suggests a sense compatible with οὔτ' ἐς ἄνδρα, especially since Creon remains the subject of the verb. (b) In ἀπηλάθην τύχης both the verb and the noun are odd. Wilamowitz says 'ἀπελαύνεσθαι attisch nicht belegt', and none of the other commentators can cite any true parallel for the implied meaning here. *Tro.* 640, ψυχὴν ἀλᾶται τῆς πάροιθ' εὐπραξίας, illustrates a quite different verb, Hdt. 7 205.1, ἀπελήλατο τῆς φροντίδος περὶ τῆς βασιληίης, a different thought. Even if one could show an example where the verb means 'is deprived of' or the like, τύχης would have to mean 'good fortune' in order for the passage to make sense. The word *can* mean 'good fortune' given a proper context: see, e. g., *El.* 594. But the context here, the uncertainty of all that comes from the gods, is not much help. 'I was not driven from (good) fortune where my father is concerned' is not very plausible.

We must thus find a replacement for both οὔτ' (presumably either οὐκ or οὖν[2]) and ἀπηλάθην. In a context stressing the uncertainty of the future, τύχη should mean something like 'fortune' or 'vicissitude'. The meaning we require is either 'Fortune was (recently) unkind to me where my father was concerned' (making the connection with 62) or 'Fortune was (formerly) kind to me' (making the contrast with 69ff.). Either meaning can be expressed with a negative or without one: the first could be either οὐκ ἐς πατέρ' ἄπειρος ἦ τύχης (but the tense is incorrect) or οὖν ἐς πατέρ' ἐπειράθην τύχης, the latter either οὐκ ἐς πατέρ' ἐπηρώθην τύχῃ or οὖν ἐς πατέρ' ἄπειρος ἦ τύχης.

Can these possibilities be reduced? We might begin by eliminating conjectures employing the negative. The position of οὐ would be odd unless ἐς πατέρα were being contrasted with something else. By contrast, if we read οὖν for οὔτ', its position is unremarkable, and in γὰρ οὖν we have a collocation often used in tragedy to explicate, of-

[1] Diggle prints Campbell's οὔτι and in the apparatus his own οὐχὶ.

[2] Theoretically οὐδ' is possible, but it imparts an emphasis ('not even as regards my father, to say nothing of myself') that is not especially welcome here.

ten with a hint of 'for at any rate': see *Med.* 533, *Hip.* 666 (if genuine), *El.* 290, *Or.* 1147, *Ba.* 922, and also Ar. *Vesp.* 726. If we wish to achieve the sense, 'As for me, I experienced fortune's vicissitudes in regard to my father', the best option seems to be ἐγὼ γὰρ οὖν ἐς πατέρ' ἐπειράθην τύχης. The aorist passive, which occurs elsewhere in Attic *sensu medio*, can be used of a recent action or experience. Alternatively, Megara may be saying that formerly she was without experience of vicissitude where her father was concerned, for which the Greek could be ἐγὼ γὰρ οὖν ἐς πατέρ' ἄπειρος (or even ἄπηρος) ἢ τύχης. (ἢ would have been corrupted to the later form ἦν almost at once, and CHN could easily have been read as ΘΗΝ, giving rise to an aorist passive.) Decision is difficult, but ἐγὼ γὰρ οὖν ἐς πατέρ' ἐπειράθην τύχης, with its strong connection to what precedes, seems best.

The problems of 66 were succinctly stated by Wilamowitz: 'Sinnlose Worte, deren Heilung unmöglich scheint, da sowohl die "Lanzen" wie das "Springen" wie die "Leiber" ungehörig sind, so daß der Sitz der Verderbnis unbestimmt bleibt.' The topic of possible assassination of tyrants by those wishing to take their place has no business here, and Diggle's deletion of 65-6, with ἔχων τε in 67, is attractive: Creon's advantages are wealth (ὄλβος) and children. We might, however, consider saving 65 by writing

ἐγὼ γὰρ οὖν ἐς πατέρ' ἐπειράθην τύχης,
ὃς οὕνεκ' ὄλβου μέγας ἐκομπάσθη ποτὲ
ἔχων τυραννίδ', ἣν μακραὶ λόγχαι πέριξ,
ἔχων δὲ τέκνα.

(πέριξ was the suggestion of Conradt. It is used with its object preceding at 243.) In that case ὄλβος will mean 'blessedness', and his blessedness will consist in two defenses against misfortune: kingship, surrounded by long spears, and children.

85-90

ἥντιν' οὖν γνώμην ἔχεις 85
λέγ' ἐς τὸ κοινόν, μὴ θανεῖν ἕτοιμον ᾖ.
Αμ. ὦ θύγατερ, οὔτοι ῥᾴδιον τὰ τοιάδε 88

φαύλως παραινεῖν, σπουδάσαντ' ἄνευ πόνου· 89
χρόνον δὲ μηκύνωμεν ὄντες ἀσθενεῖς. 87
Με. λύπης τι προσδεῖς ἢ φιλεῖς οὕτω φάος; 90

87 post 89 trai. Wilamowitz

The order of the lines in L should be retained. Mastronarde argued this case briefly in his review of Bond, *EMC* 27 (1983), 104, and I will second his arguments here. Wilamowitz' removal of 87 adversely affects 86. The negative purpose clause must be in two parts, and μὴ θανεῖν ἕτοιμον ᾖ is preliminary and subordinate: 'lest we because of weakness, with our death already unavoidable, prolong the time of our dying'. The wording of 87 also makes it less suitable for Amphitryon than for Megara: ὄντες ἀσθενεῖς surely belongs more easily in Megara's mouth, where it summarizes the points she has just finished making, than in Amphitryon's.

Amphitryon's reply is difficult. At first glance it seems to say the opposite of what we expect, for giving advice without doing anything about it is the easier, not the more difficult, course. But what he means is that to give the kind of advice Megara has asked for, mere words without any action behind them, is something that is difficult for *him,* that goes against his grain. As for the connection with what follows, Megara concludes from his having nothing to say that he has no reason to hope for safety and really is just bent on putting off the inevitable, and that is why she says 'Do you need further pain or are you so in love with the light?'

101-4

κάμνουσι γάρ τοι καὶ βροτῶν αἱ συμφοραί,
καὶ πνεύματ' ἀνέμων οὐκ ἀεὶ ῥώμην ἔχει,
οἵ τ' εὐτυχοῦντες διὰ τέλους οὐκ εὐτυχεῖς·
ἐξίσταται γὰρ πάντ' ἀπ' ἀλλήλων δίχα.

103 del. Nauck (non habet Stob., qui 101-2 et 104-6 uno tenore citat)

It is surprising that Diggle does not adopt Nauck's deletion, for strong internal evidence here receives support from the indirect tra-

dition. The internal evidence is the nature of the argument: Amphitryon says that just as winds do not keep their strength, so too misfortunes of mortals grow weak. He grounds this in the general principle that all things separate or withdraw or retire from each other, a metaphor that reminds one of S. *Aj.* 670-5, where the cessation of forces in nature is described and where ἐξίσταται is also used. The clear point of both 101-2 and the implied point of 104 is that malign forces do not operate constantly in human life: sometimes they grow weak. This is intended to be cheering. Quite different is the point of 103, that human *good* fortune is transitory. It is just conceivable that Euripides could have written 103 as the counterpart to his cheering words about the impermanence of trouble, but when we note the absence of the line from Stobaeus, we can feel confident that he did not.

254-8

> οὐ σκῆπτρα, χειρὸς δεξιᾶς ἐρείσματα,
> ἀρεῖτε καὶ τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀνόσιον κάρα
> καθαιματώσεθ', ὅστις οὐ Καδμεῖος ὢν
> ἄρχει κάκιστος τῶν ἐμῶν ἔπηλυς ὤν;
> ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐμοῦ γε δεσπόσεις χαίρων ποτὲ κτλ.

257 ἐμῶν Dobree: νέων L: cf. Hel. 1635

Diggle adopts Dobree's conjecture and cites *Hel.* 1635, where Theoclymenus, in answer to the statement that his sister Theonoe had merely restored Helen to her proper lord, says κύριος δὲ τῶν ἐμῶν τίς; Theoclymenus can refer to 'my subjects', but such words in the mouth of the Chorus of the *Heracles* seem far less appropriate. The only thing to be said in favor of Dobree's conjecture is that it presupposes a common uncial confusion, *nu* taken for *mu*, and a simple transposition of a pair of letters. There its virtues end, for not only is the sense 'my fellow-citizens' called for (a meaning for which the *Helen* passage gives no help) but in the immediate vicinity of the superlative, it would be taken as partitive, 'most vile of my fellow-citizens', rather than as the object of ἄρχει.

Let us first fix κάκιστος. We do not want 'most vile of my fellow-citizens', even assuming that τῶν ἐμῶν could have this meaning.

We do not really want an adjectival κάκιστος, which can only compete with the adjectival ἔπηλυς ὤν. Rather the adverb κάκιστα exactly fills the bill. (For α read as οc, see *HF* 870 and Jackson, *MS* 15.) The sense the passage calls for is 'Won't you bloody this man's head? He is no Cadmean, and he rules most basely over the citizens, though he is a foreigner.' In Greek this is ἄρχει κάκιστα τῶν ἐτῶν, ἔπηλυς ὤν. For ἔτης in tragedy see A. *Sup.* 247.

268-9

ὦ δεξιὰ χείρ, ὡς ποθεῖς λαβεῖν δόρυ,
ἐν δ' ἀσθενείᾳ τὸν πόθον διώλεσας.

269 πόθον Plut. mor. 793 C: πότμον L

It seems contradictory to say 'How you long (present tense) to take up the spear, but in your weakness you have lost your longing'. Either the Chorus have a longing or they have lost it, but both cannot be true. Line 268 says that they long. In 269, therefore, perhaps we should read something like ἐν δ' ἀσθενείᾳ τοὔντονον διώλεσας.

287-90: See *CJ* 81 (1986), 358.

298-301

ἀλλ' ὡς λόγοισι τόνδε μαλθάξαιμεν ἄν;
ἥκιστα· φεύγειν σκαιὸν ἄνδρ' ἐχθρὸν χρεών,
σοφοῖσι δ' εἴκειν καὶ τεθραμμένοις καλῶς·
ῥᾷον γὰρ αἰδοῖ σ' ὑποβαλὼν φίλ' ἂν τέμοις.

301 αἰδοῖ σ' ὑποβαλὼν Brunck (ὑποβαλὼν) et Cropp: αἰδοῦς ὑπολαβὼν L

Cropp's conjecture on 301 produces exactly the right sense, and the corruption seems an easy one. The two lines before it, however, still seem a problem to me: 'one should avoid an enemy who is stupid, but *yield* to those who are wise and have been properly raised'. Two classes of people, the stupid and the clever, are being con-

trasted. We are told that one should avoid the former kind of enemy. We expect to be told that one should, e. g., choose one's enemies or generally associate with people from the latter, not that one should perform a quite unrelated action of 'yielding' to them. 'Yielding' seems the opposite of what one should do to those who are wise and well raised, for it suggests staying out of their path. Yet I know of no remotely plausible substitute for εἴκειν. Perhaps the line is transmitted as Euripides wrote it but in σοφοῖσι δ' εἴκειν the infinitive is epexegetic, those 'skilled at yielding', a group identical with those who have been gently raised. If so, a line must be missing, e. g.

φεύγειν σκαιὸν ἄνδρ' ἐχθρὸν χρεών,
σοφοῖσι δ' εἴκειν καὶ τεθραμμένοις καλῶς
⟨σοφὸν συνελθεῖν ἐς λόγους καὶ χρήσιμον⟩ ·
ῥᾷον γὰρ αἰδοῖ σ' ὑποβαλὼν φίλ' ἂν τέμοις.

'One must avoid an enemy who is stupid, but to enter into converse with those who are good at yielding and have been properly raised is a wise and useful thing.'

529-35

φέρ' ἐκπύθωμαι τῶνδε πλησίον σταθείς·
γύναι, τί καινὸν ἦλθε δώμασιν χρέος;
Με. ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν ⟨Αμ.⟩ ὦ φάος μολὼν πατρί
⟨Με.⟩ ἥκεις, ἐσώθης εἰς ἀκμὴν ἐλθὼν φίλοις;
Ηρ. τί φῄς; τίν' ἐς ταραγμὸν ἥκομεν, πάτερ;
Με. διωλλύμεσθα· σὺ δέ, γέρον, σύγγνωθί μοι,
εἰ πρόσθεν ἥρπασ' ἃ σὲ λέγειν πρὸς τόνδ' ἐχρῆν·

531 ⟨Αμ.⟩ Frey 532 ⟨Με.⟩ Murray: ras. in L

The scene above as constituted by Diggle is certainly lively. Heracles asks his wife a question, she manages to utter a vocative, Amphitryon manages another one, and she finishes the sentence. Then Heracles asks his father a question and Megara, explicitly noting the breach of decorum, gets in ahead of Amphitryon and answers it. Is this what Euripides wrote?

There are minor indications that it is not. First, although Amphitryon has not had a chance to say more than a vocative phrase, Heracles says to him τί φῄς (singular); τίν' ἐς ταραγμὸν ἥκομεν, πάτερ; Either one would expect him to recognize that both have been speaking (τί φατε or the like) or to ask for elucidation from Megara, who has actually said something other than a vocative and whom he addresses in the first place. Second, τῶνδε πλησίον σταθείς is odd: why say that he is standing next to 'these men', i. e. the Chorus, if he wants to enter into conversation with his wife and father?

As transmitted, 531-2 are both spoken by the same person. That seems more likely on the face of it than that they should be broken up in the lively but unconvincing manner suggested by Frey and Murray. Elmsley proposed that the two lines belong to Amphitryon, and that L's attribution to Megara is mistaken. Wilamowitz agreed. There is no reason why ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν has to mean 'dearest of husbands': it could just as well mean 'dearest of men' and thus fit perfectly well in Amphitryon's mouth. In that case Heracles' 'What are you (singular) saying? What is the distress into which we have come, father?' now is perfectly in order: Amphitryon has spoken, and Heracles asks him for clarification. Here Megara leaps in, explicitly noting that she is answering a question addressed to someone else.

Wilamowitz also adopts Elmsley's deletion of γύναι in 530, and the corresponding insertion of ⟨ἡμῖν⟩ before ἦλθε to replace the two deleted syllables. This may seem like a desperate attempt to restore tragic decorum in the teeth of the manuscript transmission, but it brings with it another advantage besides decorum. As noted above, τῶνδε πλησίον σταθείς, 'standing next to these men', is odd, and that is the way we must translate if we read and punctuate with Diggle. If, however, we remove the vocative γύναι, as Elmsley did, we can punctuate 529-30 as one sentence containing an indirect question, taking τῶνδε as the genitive of source (cf. *El.* 109 and *Pho.* 768) with ἐκπύθωμαι: 'Come let me stand nearer and ask them what new misfortune has come upon our house'. As he moves toward center stage and before he can ask his question, his father addresses him. The passage deserves to be printed as below.

φέρ' ἐκπύθωμαι τῶνδε, πλησίον σταθείς,
τί καινὸν ⟨ἡμῖν⟩ ἦλθε δώμασιν χρέος.
Αμ. ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν, ὦ φάος μολὼν πατρί,
ἥκεις, ἐσώθης εἰς ἀκμὴν ἐλθὼν φίλοις;
Ηρ. τί φῄς; τίν' ἐς ταραγμὸν ἥκομεν, πάτερ;
Με. διωλλύμεσθα· σὺ δέ, γέρον, σύγγνωθί μοι,
εἰ πρόσθεν ἥρπασ' ἃ σὲ λέγειν πρὸς τόνδ' ἐχρῆν·

588-92: See *GRBS* 23 (1982), 32-3.

642-6

μή μοι μήτ' Ἀσιήτιδος
τυραννίδος ὄλβος εἴη,
μὴ χρυσοῦ δώματα πλήρη
τᾶς ἥβας ἀντιλαβεῖν, κτλ.

The Chorus express their desire for youth by saying it is worth more than Asian autocracy or houses full of gold. Perhaps they said, as they are made to say in L, 'No blessedness of eastern potentates be mine, no houses filled with gold to take in the stead of youth!' But perhaps what they said was 'May it never fall to my lot to take in exchange for youth either the wealth of eastern potentates or houses filled with gold!' The advantage of this is that the Chorus would not be deprecating, as such, the wealth of eastern potentates and houses filled with gold, only exchanging them for youth. Perhaps therefore read ὄλβον, taking ἀπὸ κοινοῦ in the second half εἴη and in the first half τᾶς ἥβας ἀντιλαβεῖν.

671-2: See *CJ* 81 (1986), 358.

843-8: See *CJ* 81 (1986), 358-9.

851-4

ἄβατον δὲ χώραν καὶ θάλασσαν ἀγρίαν
ἐξημερώσας θεῶν ἀνέστησεν μόνος
τιμὰς πιτνούσας ἀνοσίων ἀνδρῶν ὕπο·

ὥστ' οὐ παραινῶ μεγάλα βουλεῦσαι κακά.

854 ὥστ' Musgrave: σοί τ' L: σοὶ δ' Nauck servatis σοί τ' lac. ante h. v. indic. Wilamowitz βουλεῦσαι Camper: βούλεσθαι L

The change involved in Musgrave's ὥστ' in 854 is not that large, and if the sense thereby achieved were perfect, there would be no cause for complaint. But it is not. 'Therefore I recommend to you not to plot great harm' needs a further object 'against him', for Lyssa cannot be dissuading Hera from plotting great harm *in general.* Lyssa urges Hera and Iris not to harm Heracles because he is the benefactor of the gods, who restored their worship. She is not urging on Hera a policy of general non-maleficence. Nor can she be saying that Hera might do herself harm in harming Heracles: μεγάλα βουλεῦσαι κακά could not mean that. Wilamowitz' lacuna, therefore, is virtually certain, and the σοί τ' transmitted in 854 implies that there was a second recipient of Lyssa's advice, obviously Hera (cf. 831-2, 840-1, and 855). Read, e. g.,

ἄβατον δὲ χώραν καὶ θάλασσαν ἀγρίαν
ἐξημερώσας θεῶν ἀνέστησεν μόνος
τιμὰς πιτνούσας ἀνοσίων ἀνδρῶν ὕπο·
⟨ἐς τοῦτον Ἥρᾳ τῇ Διὸς συναόρῳ⟩
σοί τ' οὐ παραινῶ μεγάλα βουλεῦσαι κακά.

867-9

ἦν ἰδού· καὶ δὴ τινάσσει κρᾶτα βαλβίδων ἄπο
καὶ διαστρόφους ἑλίσσει σῖγα γοργωποὺς κόρας,
ἀμπνοὰς δ' οὐ σωφρονίζει, ταῦρος ὣς ἐς ἐμβολήν, κτλ.

I have no solution here and merely state the problem. There is an inherent ambiguity whenever a simile is attached to a negative statement. Does the thing to which the simile is compared consist of a negatived or a non-negatived notion? In 'he does not control his breathing, like a bull about to charge' is it controlling or not controlling that resembles a bull? Here the answer is obvious (bulls about to charge pant or snort furiously), but still the negative expression makes for a

lack of clarity. Nor is that the only problem. For the verb σωφρονίζει normally means 'chasten', and that is not quite the sense we require. It may be that οὐ σωφρονίζει is some kind of explanatory gloss that has somehow replaced a positive expression, perhaps something like ἵησι πυκνάς.

880-4

βέβακεν ἐν δίφροισιν ἁ πολύστονος,
ἅρμασι δ' ἐνδίδωσι
κέντρον ὡς ἐπὶ λώβᾳ
Νυκτὸς Γοργὼν ἑκατογκεφάλοις
ὄφεων ἰαχήμασι Λύσσα μαρμαρωπός.

Iris and Lyssa arrive by *mechane*, as seems plain from 815-7. But they do not both depart in the same direction. Lyssa in 872-3 tells Iris to go to Olympus while she herself slips unseen into the house of Heracles. The evidence for an exit from the roof of the *skene* by ladder or stairway behind it is set out by Mastronarde, *CA* 9 (1990), 247-94 (260-1 and 268-9 on *HF*). What we expect then is that Iris will leave by the *mechane* and Lyssa will descend the stairway behind the *skene* into the house.

What 880ff. as transmitted say is something quite different, namely that Lyssa has gone off in her chariot, goading her horses on. This discrepancy has been dealt with in two ways. Wilamowitz, *Herakles* ii.148, says that the actor who plays Lyssa does not in fact go into the house but departs on the *mechane,* and that the discrepancy between what Lyssa promises to do and what the audience see is covered by ἄφαντοι in 873. Bond and Halleran, by contrast, have the actor enter the house (Halleran by a stairway or ladder at the back) and appear to interpret 880ff. as purely metaphorical. A. S. Way's translation makes metaphor easier by translating βέβακεν ἐν δίφροισιν as 'she hath mounted her car'.

Wilamowitz' solution seems highly unlikely. It is much more plausible to assume that Iris and Lyssa do the actions Lyssa assigns them. But is the chariot language of 880-2 metaphorical? Is 'she hath mounted' the correct translation of βέβακεν? That it is a possible one is clear from 178, *Pho.* 172, fr. 1079.8, etc. But βέβηκε, βεβᾶσι, and

similar verbs are used of those who have recently left the stage or some other location at *Alc.* 767, *Andr.* 1061, *Su.* 1039, 1043, *HF* 24, 621, 955, *Tro.* 617, 1145, *IT* 1289, *Ion* 749, *Hel.* 605, 617, 1515, 1522, 1613, *Pho.* 861, 1322, *Or.* 1185, and *Rh.* 577, and such a use seems apt here. Furthermore, βέβακεν ἐν δίφροισιν ἁ πολύστονος could well describe a departure on the *mechane*, for it would have been simple to fit out the *mechane*, as was done in *Medea*, to look like a divine chariot. But if so, 880-2 describe only Iris' departure, and before 883 we must mark a lacuna giving a verb to go with Lyssa. All it needs to say is that she has gone into the house. Since 883 is anapestic and 884 has an anapestic opening, an anapestic dimeter would be appropriate, e. g.

βέβακεν ἐν δίφροισιν ἁ πολύστονος,
ἅρμασι δ' ἐνδίδωσι
κέντρον ὡς ἐπὶ λώβᾳ,
⟨ἀλλ' ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ μελάθρων φρούδα⟩
Νυκτὸς Γοργὼν ἑκατογκεφάλοις
ὄφεων ἰαχήμασι Λύσσα μαρμαρωπός.

There is further gain here in that the two descriptive expressions (ἁ πολύστονος, Νυκτὸς Γοργὼν ἑκατογκεφάλοις ὄφεων ἰαχήμασι . . . μαρμαρωπός) refer to different persons, not to the same person with two different verbs, which is somewhat awkward. Also it would be more characteristic of Iris to lay the lash on the horses to do them harm (ἐπὶ λώβᾳ). Lyssa does her job, but, as one can see, she is not out to cause gratuitous pain.

910-2: See *CJ* 81 (1986), 359.

913-6

Εξ. τεθνᾶσι παῖδες. ⟨Χο.⟩ αἰαῖ.
⟨Εξ.⟩ στενάζεθ' ὡς στενακτά. ⟨Χο.⟩ δάιοι φόνοι,
δάιοι δὲ τοκέων χέρες.
Εξ. οὐκ ἄν τις εἴποι μᾶλλον ἢ πεπόνθαμεν.

Translators are put to desperate shifts with 916: 'No words could tell what we have seen' (Arrowsmith), 'Wie grausam, weh, sie war, wer kann es schildern?' (Wilamowitz), 'Nulle parole ne peut exprimer notre malheur' (Parmentier), 'What we have suffered is more than words can tell' (Vellacott). Halleran alone translates literally, 'One could not say more than we have suffered', but this just shows why everyone else took refuge in paraphrase. For even if we suppose that μᾶλλον can be the object of εἴποι and mean something like 'more terrible things', it does not seem particularly apt to say 'No one could speak more terrible things than we have suffered'.

Years ago I thought of emending the line so that the contrast was between personal experience and knowledge from other sources, the messenger saying, in effect, only we who have had personal experience of this disaster can properly say how terrible it was. I suggested οὐκ ἄν τις εἴποι μᾶλλον ἢ ⟨οἵ⟩ πεπόνθαμεν. But μᾶλλον is still a problem (a passage such as *Od.* 6.185, μάλιστα δέ τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοί, is only partially encouraging), and the synizesis has no real parallel. Perhaps another solution is in order. In the course of this astrophon the messenger has fragments of iambic lines (910, 911, 913, 914) and then finally a whole line (916). But there is no obvious reason why he could not have had two. Perhaps then read:

Εξ. οὐκ ἄν τις εἴποι μᾶλλον ἢ πεπόνθαμεν
⟨ἀπροσδόκητα καὶ στενακτὰ πήματα⟩.

953-8

ὁ δ' εἷρπ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω κατὰ στέγας,
μέσον δ' ἐς ἀνδρῶν' ἐσπεσὼν Νίσου πόλιν
ἥκειν ἔφασκε, δωμάτων τ' ἔσω βεβὼς
κλιθεὶς ἐς οὖδας ὡς ἔχει σκευάζεται
θοίνην. διελθὼν δ' ὡς βραχὺν χρόνον μονῆς
Ἰσθμοῦ ναπαίας ἔλεγε προσβαίνειν πλάκας.

955-6 δωμάτων τ' . . . κλιθεὶς Wilamowitz: δωμάτων . . . κλιθεὶς δ' L 956 ἔχει Dobree: ἐκεῖ L 957 ὡς Kirchhoff: εἰς L

Wilamowitz' and Dobree's conjectures in 955-6 are correctly accepted by Diggle. In 957, however, I confess that I do not understand Kirchhoff's ὡς (written ὥς in the second edition). Heracles traverses some portion of his house 'for a short time', not 'as if for a short time'. Nor can ὡς be use here with approximating sense: βραχὺν is already indefinite. Transmitted ἐς βραχὺν χρόνον, 'for a short time', may not be adequately protected by the passages in LSJ s.v. εἰς II.2, for I could find only *HF* 143 τίν' ἐς χρόνον to support the meaning 'for' a period of time, and this passage could also be interpreted as 'until'. Better to emend to ἐπὶ: cf. *Med.* 355 ἐφ' ἡμέραν μίαν (genuine: see *AJP* 114 [1993], 55, n. 18) and *El.* 425 ἕν γ' ἐπ' ἦμαρ.

That leaves the last word of 957 to be dealt with. It is true that Euripides uses μονή at *Tro.* 1129, and Wilamowitz tries to salvage it by writing ἐν μονῇ βραχὺν χρόνον. But in later Greek it is the word for 'apartment' (see John 14.2 and 23), and, though the word cannot be correct here in this sense, it may have been used to gloss a word here. The passage may have said that Heracles passed through the chambers or apartments for a short time. We should dagger μονῆς. I suggest στέγας as a possible replacment. The reference would then be to 953.

1009-12

ἡμεῖς δ' ἐλευθεροῦντες ἐκ δρασμῶν πόδα 1010
σὺν τῷ γέροντι δεσμὰ σειραίων βρόχων 1009
ἀνήπτομεν πρὸς κίον', ὡς λήξας ὕπνου
μηδὲν προσεργάσαιτο τοῖς δεδραμένοις.

1009 et 1010 inter se trai. Pierson

Pierson's transposition of 1009 to follow 1010 is undoubtedly right. It restores a sentence connective to the beginning of the sentence and leads in properly to the next stage of the narrative. Thereafter all may not be well. I translate literally: 'We [servants], freeing our feet from running, in cooperation with the old man tied the bonds of twisted cord to a pillar [only these and not also Heracles?], so that when he had waked from sleep he might not do anything in addition to what has already been done'. Some may find it easy, having read

'tie the twisted cords to the pillar', to understand 'bind Heracles to the pillar by means of the twisted cords'. But it is also possible that something is missing, e. g.

σὺν τῷ γέροντι δεσμὰ σειραίων βρόχων
⟨ἀμφ' ἄνδρα μάργον ἀμφελίξαντες χεροῖν⟩
ἀνήπτομεν πρὸς κίον', ὡς λήξας ὕπνου
μηδὲν προσεργάσαιτο τοῖς δεδραμένοις.

1089-93

ἔα·
ἔμπνους μέν εἰμι καὶ δέδορχ' ἅπερ με δεῖ,
αἰθέρα τε καὶ γῆν τόξα θ' Ἡλίου τάδε.
ὡς ⟨δ'⟩ ἐν κλύδωνι καὶ φρενῶν ταράγματι
πέπτωκα δεινῷ καὶ πνοὰς θερμὰς πνέω
μετάρσι', οὐ βέβαια πλευμόνων ἄπο.

1089 ἔμπνους Tr^1: ἔμπους L 1091 ⟨δ'⟩ Reiske

As L corrected by Triclinius gives the passage, Heracles is surprised to find himself alive. That is perhaps understandable since he has just been knocked unconscious by the huge boulder Pallas Athena hurled at him. But there are difficulties. He says that he sees 'the things I ought to see, the upper air and the earth and the rays of Helios'. This could be taken to mean that he is aware that he is not in the Underworld. But it is more likely to mean that his vision is no longer clouded by madness. Wilamowitz' comment on 1089 reads: 'ich sehe die Dinge in ihrem richtigen Lichte, mein Auge deckt kein Nebel. Auch Agaue sagt, als sie aus dem Wahnsinn zur Besinnung erwacht, daß sie das Himmelslicht plötzlich rein und hell sähe, Bakch. 1267'. This seems right, but its consequences will have to be faced.

Heracles says he is sane. That is what we might expect in any case. Lyssa cast a fit of madness on him so that he would kill his children. Now they are dead, and we expect that his fit will have passed. Heracles has also awakened from a deep sleep, as Orestes does at *Or.* 211. There Orestes too is lucid, at least until his next

attack. Why should Heracles be any different? Does not everything point to his being in his right mind here? In view of the parallel with *Ba.* 1264ff., we should almost certainly adopt Wecklein's ἔννους, the word Agave uses of herself in a similar context, where the brightness of the sky is a sign that sanity has returned. This makes the relevance of sky, earth, and sun instantly clear.

In explicating what follows, however, Wilamowitz seems to recant. 'Her. täuscht sich im ersten Augenblick: das gesteht der letzte Vers seiner Rede ein.' Lingering madness provides him with the solution to the syntax of 1091. On the one hand, a particle of transition seems desirable, but on the other, exclamatory ὡς, as Bond notes, is used almost exclusively in asyndeton, and there is no example of exclamatory ὡς δέ in Euripides. Wilamowitz prints the text without Reiske's ⟨δ'⟩ and comments that Heracles 'kann nur kurze abgerissene Sätze vorbringen'. He notes that there is nothing to answer the μέν in 1089. Murray prints the triple dots of interrupted speech after 1090, which is presumably meant to indicate the same thing.

But is Heracles mistaken? The last line of his speech does not admit this but only that he finds himself in circumstances that he cannot understand. It seems confusing for the playwright to make him tell the audience that his vision has cleared if it has not. And there is no dramatic reason why Heracles should not be in his right mind at this point, and parallels suggest that he is.

In favor of Wilamowitz's view is the fact that in 1091-3 Heracles speaks of the symptoms of madness as if they were part of his present experience (πέπτωκα, πνέω). But in fact it is not true for Heracles to say 'I *have fallen* into a dreadful wave of mental confusion': he is in fact calmly reasoning things out. Nor is it likely to be true that the actor who plays him pants.[1] The tenses here are both wrong.

Can this contradiction be removed? Can grammar and sense be restored? Let us ask ourselves one question. Heracles on our best hypothesis is startled to find himself in his right mind: ἔα. Why? Because

[1] Contrast *Or.* 276, where the fit was on Orestes only one line earlier. Heracles has been asleep for some time. Willink comments, 'A medical treatise alludes to the expulsion of air from the lungs at the moment of recovery from a fit', but in actuality what Hippocrates, περὶ φυσῶν 14, says is that the violent motion of the epilectic's body causes the excess air in his blood to dissipate, some of it escaping with the breath, some with phlegm, and some in the foam that forms at his mouth. These symptoms belong to the fit itself and not to a time when the patient has recovered.

he can remember the point just before he slipped into madness and the world grew dark. The messenger described that moment at 928-30:

μέλλων δὲ δαλὸν χειρὶ δεξιᾷ φέρειν,
ἐς χέρνιβ' ὡς βάψειεν, 'Αλκμήνης τόκος
ἔστη σιωπῇ.

Thereafter followed several physical symptoms of madness. Heracles can remember the moment those symptoms began. That is what he is describing here, though to make sense of what L gives us, we must supplement it:

ἔα·
ἔννους μέν εἰμι καὶ δέδορχ' ἅπερ με δεῖ,
αἰθέρα τε καὶ γῆν τόξα θ' Ἡλίου τάδε,
⟨ἐπῃσθόμην δὲ πῦρ ἔχων ἐν δεξιᾷ⟩
ὡς ἐν κλύδωνι καὶ φρενῶν ταράγματι
πέπτωκα δεινῷ καὶ πνοὰς θερμὰς πνέω
μετάρσι', οὐ βέβαια, πλευμόνων ἄπο.

'What does this mean? I am in my right mind, my eyes have the vision that they ought to have, and I see the bright air, the earth, and the shafts of sunlight. <Yet when I held the torch in my hand, I noticed> that I had fallen into a dreadful wave of mental confusion and that my breath was coming hot and in shallow panting, not steadily, from my lungs.' Note that the three last lines now give perfect sense exactly as we find them in L. There is a δέ to answer μέν, we do not need to write the unattested exclamatory ὡς δ', and the tenses of πέπτωκα and πνέω now refer not to the present but, since they are in *oratio obliqua*, to the time of the verb that introduces them.

1159-62

φέρ', ἀμφὶ κρατὶ περιβάλω σκότον ⟨ ⟩.
αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ τοῖς δεδραμένοις κακοῖς,
καὶ τῷδε προστρόπαιον αἷμα προσβαλὼν
οὐδὲν κακῶσαι τοὺς ἀναιτίους θέλω.

1159 σκότον Dindorf: -ος L ⟨πέπλων⟩ Pflugk (fort. melius π- σ): cf. Or. 1457 1161 προσβαλὼν Canter: -λαβὼν L

Lines 1161-2 are a bit awkward, for Theseus is referred to twice (τῷδε and τοὺς ἀναιτίους) in the same sentence. It is possible to translate 'and I do not at all wish, by casting blood-guilt on this man, to harm the innocent'. But it is at least worth considering whether 1162 might be a separate sentence in asyndeton and the rest made into a more unitary thought:

αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ ἐπὶ δεδραμένοις κακοῖς
καὶ τῷδε προστρόπαιον αἷμα προσβαλεῖν·
οὐδὲν κακῶσαι τοὺς ἀναιτίους θέλω.

It is true that αἰσχύνομαι can be construed with a dative. But it is also construed with participle ('I am ashamed that I am doing something') and infinitive ('shame prevents me from doing something'). It is the latter that is more appropriate here.

1220-2

οὐδὲν μέλει μοι σύν γε σοὶ πράσσειν κακῶς·
καὶ γάρ ποτ' εὐτύχησ'. ἐκεῖσ' ἀνοιστέον
ὅτ' ἐξέσωσάς μ' ἐς φάος νεκρῶν πάρα.

'It does not matter to me if I fare badly along with you. For I also once fared well [sc. with you]. I must refer it to the time when you brought me safely back up to the light from the land of the dead.' But what is to be referred to the time of Theseus' recue from Hades is not his *sharing* of Heracles' prosperity but his prosperity *tout court*. Any prosperity he has had in his life depends on his having been rescued from the consequences of his youthful folly, the attempted abduction of Persephone. Hard to see, therefore, why Diggle does not adopt or even mention Kirchhoff's palmary κεἰ γάρ ποτ' εὐτύχησ' ἐκεῖσ' ἀνοιστέον κτλ., 'For if I ever had any success (i. e. any success I ever had) it is owing to the time when you brought me safely back up to the light from the land of the dead'. It is his gratitude for this that explains why he does not fear to share in Heracles' misfortune.

1236-42

Θη. ἐγὼ δὲ πάσχων εὖ τότ' οἰκτίρω σε νῦν.
Ηρ. οἰκτρὸς γάρ εἰμι τἄμ' ἀποκτείνας τέκνα;
Θη. κλαίω χάριν σὴν ἐφ' ἑτέραισι συμφοραῖς.
Ηρ. ηὗρες δέ γ' ἄλλους ἐν κακοῖσι μείζοσιν;
Θη. ἅπτῃ κάτωθεν οὐρανοῦ δυσπραξίᾳ.
Ηρ. τοιγὰρ παρεσκευάσμεθ' ὥστε κατθανεῖν.
⟨Θη. ⟩
⟨Ηρ. ⟩
Θη. δοκεῖς ἀπειλῶν σῶν μέλειν τι δαίμοσιν;

1237 interrogationis notam add. West 1239 δ' ἔτ' Fix, δὲ κἄλλους Blaydes 1241 post h. v. lac. indic. W. Schmid, Broadhead

Line 1238 has been translated in the following ways: 'I weep for thy sake, for thy fortune changed' (Way), 'My tears, my gratitude, I mourn your grief' (Arrowsmith), 'Ja, dankbar trag' ich fremde Schmerzen mit' (Wilamowitz), 'Mes pleurs te rendent grâces, quand le sort t'est contraire' (Parmentier), 'I weep for your sake at external misfortunes' (Halleran), 'Yes; now that things have changed with you—I weep for you' (Vellacott), 'I feel compassion for *you*, over συμφοραί which are not you' (West, *Philologus* 117 [1973], 148). The diversity of these renderings and (Halleran's excepted) their distance from the Greek is remarkable. Sensible comment is scarce. In particular, neither editors nor translators have apparently asked themselves or thoughtfully answered two basic questions: (1) What is the construction of ἐφ' ἑτέραισι συμφοραῖς? and (2) What is the construction of χάριν σὴν?

So far as this can be determined from renderings that are somewhat impressionistic, the majority of translators take ἐφ' ἑτέραισι συμφοραῖς closely with κλαίω, 'I weep over . . . misfortunes'. The chances that this is correct are so small as to be negligible. Though we weep *over* things in English, neither κλαίω nor any of its compounds is listed in LSJ as taking ἐπί or any other sort of prepositional phrase as a complement. κλαίω is either 'to weep' absolutely or, if the object of one's tears is to be expressed, that object goes into the accusative. Greek simply does not say κλαίω ἐπί τινι. LSJ's story is

confirmed by a detailed examination of tragic usage. κλαίω and its compounds are used hundreds of times in Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, the *tragici minores* and the tragic adespota. Out of all these instances, not once is the verb used with a prepositional phrase as complement. This is unlikely to be accidental. The conclusion is clear: 'I weep over . . . misfortunes' is almost certainly not the construction.

As for χάριν σὴν, many seem to take it as adverbial, 'for your sake' (thus Way, Halleran, West, LSJ s.v. VI.1.b). This is possible, but since Heracles' *kindness* to Theseus has been repeatedly mentioned (cf. 1169-70, 1221-2, 1235, 1236), the possibility that it means 'your favor, kindness' cannot be excluded.

The other evidence for the meaning of the line, as Bond points out, is Heracles' reply in 1237, which should be translated 'But have you actually *found* others in greater misfortune?' This implies that Theseus had said or implied something about the misfortunes of other men than Heracles. This ought to be relevant to the construction of ἐφ' ἑτέραισι συμφοραῖς. The meaning of ἑτέραισι requires examination. Translations vary: 'other (than my own)' (Wilamowitz, Gray-Hutchinson), 'external (to you)' (West, Halleran), and the euphemistic 'other (than good), changed (for the worse)' (Way). Of these, the first is dubious as Greek (we would expect ἑτέρων [sc. ἢ ἐμαῖς]) and, as Bond points out, inadequate sense. The second is described by Bond as 'a frigid but effective piece of sophistry'. Frigid it is, but its effectiveness is diminished by the fact that it could hardly have been understood in this way. For ἕτερος does not mean 'external to' but 'other than'. 'Other disasters (than X)' implies that X is a disaster. If we substitute 'you' for X, as West and Bond invite us to do, we reach the unpalatable conclusion that Heracles is conceived of as himself being a disaster. This will not do. Bond argues further that 'ἑτέραισι in this sense naturally suggests the notion of other people to whom the disasters do pertain, and so leads to Heracles' reply . . .'. The logic here is strained. The movement from 'disasters that are external to you' to 'disasters that pertain to other people' is to my mind far from obvious. 'Heracles himself makes a simpler point about externality at 1249', but in fact this verse contribtues precisely nothing to this argument, being the commonplace that Person A often gives advice to Person B about bearing disasters which

Person A does not have to bear. There is nothing here about disasters being external to people.

We are left with the third, 'other (than good), changed (for the worse)'. If we take the whole phrase as meaning 'in circumstances of changed (or evil) fortune', we arrive at possible sense: κλαίω χάριν σὴν ἐφ' ἑτέραισι συμφοραῖς (sc. οὖσαν) means 'I lament that your kindness has turned out so badly'. (Cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπί B.I.i.) Another option is 'I lament *for your sake* in circumstances that are changed for the worse'.

Three objections present themselves. First, the euphemistic sense ἕτερος is much easier if some word for 'good' precedes: see the examples in Bond. Second, nothing about this line concerns the misfortunes of other men and thereby motivates Heracles' reply. Third, it is difficult to supply the participle οὖσαν this sense requires. It is possible that our problems are caused by the omission of a line and two half-lines, e. g.

Ηρ. οἰκτρὸς γάρ εἰμι τἄμ' ἀποκτείνας τέκνα;
Θη. κλαίω χάριν σὴν ⟨ἀντιπάσχουσαν κακῶς.⟩
⟨Ηρ. ἀλλ' εἶδον ἀδίκους πρὸς θεῶν πάσχοντας εὖ.⟩
⟨Θη. καὶ τοὺς σέβοντάς γ'⟩ ἐφ' ἑτέραισι συμφοραῖς.
Ηρ. ηὗρες δέ γ' ἄλλους ἐν κακοῖσι μείζοσιν;

Diggle follows W. Schmid and Broadhead in marking a lacuna after 1241. Certainly the reference in 1242 to the gods' paying no heed to Heracles' threats is unintelligible as the text stands, and none of the suggested alterations of κατθανεῖν is persuasive. When one marks a lacuna, it is a kindness to the reader to show what might once have stood there. West suggests '<(Thes.) And what will you achieve by dying? (Her.) It will at least show up the savageness of the gods.>'. This is not much of a threat, however. Heracles could expect to die in the ordinary course of nature, and his hastening the process doesn't do the gods any particular harm even if they are thought to be responsible. Perhaps something more forceful has been lost:

Ηρ. τοιγὰρ παρεσκευάσμεθ' ὥστε κατθανεῖν.
⟨Θη. τί δῆτ' ἔχοις ἄν, εἰ τόδ' ἔρξειας, πλέον;⟩
⟨Ηρ. τὸν θεᾶς ἄθικτον βωμὸν αἱμάξω θανών.⟩
Θη. δοκεῖς ἀπειλῶν σῶν μέλειν τι δαίμοσιν;

TROADES

95-7: See *CQ* 33 (1983), 334-8, and 'ΜΩΡΟΣ ΔΕ ΘΝΗΤΩΝ ΟΣΤΙΣ ΕΚΠΟΡΘΕΙ ΠΟΛΕΙΣ: Nochmal zu Euripides, Troerinnen 95-97', forthcoming in *RhM.*

112-5: See *AJP* 105 (1984), 239-40.

308: See *AJP* 105 (1984), 240.

424-6

ἦ δεινὸς ὁ λάτρις. τί ποτ' ἔχουσι τοὔνομα
κήρυκες, ἓν ἀπέχθημα πάγκοινον βροτοῖς,
οἱ περὶ τυράννους καὶ πόλεις ὑπηρέται;

Euripides in more than one place has his characters utter disparaging remarks about heralds: see *Hcld.* 292-3, 426, *Su.* 458-62. But there the heralds in question have been abusive and arrogant. Talthybius, by contrast, has not been noticeably so. He is annoyed at Cassandra's ill-omened words about his masters, words uttered when they are just about to depart on a long and perilous sea-journey (408-10), but since he thinks Cassandra is mad (417-9), he means to ignore what she says. He comments on Agamemnon's strange taste in women and says it is not his own (411-6), but there is nothing abusive or hostile about his stated opinion that a madwoman would not be his cup of tea for a mistress. His remarks to Hecuba (421-3) are kindly enough, assuring her that she will be the slave of Penelope, who is a good woman. Why are Cassandra's remarks above so harsh? In what sense does Talthybius deserve the epithet δεινός? Neither his cleverness nor (assuming irony) his stupidity is particularly noteworthy here. Nor is he a particularly *dangerous* or *fearsome* man. The emphasis falls on the one hand on his hatefulness (which is inexplicable in this context) and on the other on his being no more than a λάτρις. Some have found it a telling stroke that Cassandra picks up this word, with which Talthybius had described Hecuba, and applies it to

the whole procedure. One might have expected something snappier such as λάτριν καλεῖς σὺ μητέρ', αὐτὸς ὢν λάτρις; or the like.

There can be little doubt that Euripides wrote these lines, but did he write them for this play? Perhaps some other play had a truly abusive and dangerous herald, whose actions were sufficiently revolting to justify calling heralds an object of universal hatred. Like the heralds of Eurystheus (*Hcld.*) and Creon (*Su.*) they were clearly carrying out the cruel orders of absent tyrants or cities and so the emphasis on heralds as servants would make sense. The lines were transferred here perhaps because some actor liked adding a few lines of mouth-filling abuse to his part and perhaps also because he was reminded of them by λάτρις two lines earlier. Cassandra's speech then originally began with the bare statement (I punctuate it as a statement) 'You claim that my mother will go to Odysseus' house'. The asyndeton, which is a problem with 423-6 preceding, now is perfectly in order.

592-4

Εκ. τέκνων δή ποθ' ἁμῶν
πρεσβυγενὲς Πριάμῳ.
Αν. κοιμίσαι μ' ἐς Ἅιδου.

In the first volume of his OCT Diggle, noticing that Euripidean lyric uses the Doric genitive Ἅιδα in preference to the Attic Ἅιδου, changes the transmitted Attic form to Doric at *Hip.* 1388 and *Hec.* 1076. But he seems not to have come to this conclusion in time to correct the single instance of lyric Ἅιδου in Volume Two, which was published three years before Volume One. Andromache's κοιμίσαι μ' ἐς Ἅιδου should probably be altered as well.

In order to be sure just how it is to be altered, however, we must consider the evidence of Euripidean usage with some care. There are sixteen instances in Euripidean lyric where the Doric genitive is transmitted or where what is transmitted leads to the inevitable conclusion that Ἅιδα or Ἀΐδα is what Euripides wrote: *Alc.* 126 (ἅδα LP, ἀίδα BOV), 436 (Ἀΐδα Lascaris, ἅδ* L, ἅδα P), 457 ἀίδα fere BOV, ἅδου LP), 462 (Ἅιδα Lascaris, ἀίδα BOV<L>, ἅδαο P and Tr), *Med.* 980 (Ἅιδα Brunck, ἀίδα codd.), *Hcld.* 912 (Ἅιδα Elmsley, ἀίδα L), *Andr.* 1046 (αΐδα H, ἅδα VL, ἀίδα MODAP:

Campbell's Δαναΐδαις should be rejected: see *Andromache* 43), *Hec.* 483 (῞Αιδα Canter, ἀίδα all but one of the manuscripts, ἀίδη R), 1105 (῞Αιδα Dindorf: ἀίδα the large majority, -δαν MBO and $R^{\gamma\rho}V^{3}$, -δαο LVZm, -δου $R^{s}V^{3s}$), *El.* 122 (Ἀίδα Hermann, ἅδα Tr^{1} et fort. L), 143 (passage corrupt but Ἀίδα probably right), *HF* 117, 736 (ἐξ ῞Αιδα Wilamowitz, ἐς ἀίδαν <L>P), 1026, *IT* 169, *Or.* 1399 (῞Αιδα the vast majority of the manuscripts, a sprinking of minority readings). In view of this evidence, Diggle was right to emend *Hip.* 1388 and *Hec.* 1076. And the present passage should also be emended into the Doric dialect.

But we should consider emending to ἐς ῞Αιδαν rather than ἐς ῞Αιδα. In Attic passages of Euripides, to refer to Hades as a place, it is usual to use the genitive after ε(ἰ)ς or ἐν, with δόμος or the like understood: cf. *Med.* 1110, *Hip.* 829, *Hec.* 418, *El.* 662, *HF* 24, 453, 1101, 1331, *Tro.* 442, 445, *Or.* 1584, *Ba.* 857, *Rh.* 915. It is also possible to use ῞Αιδης in its own proper case as the name of the place: ἐς ῞Αιδην at *Hi.* 1366 and *Su.* 797 (but in both of these 'Hades'= 'death'); πρὸς ῞Αιδην at *Andr.* 414; ῞Αιδην as accusative of place whither at *Andr.* 544. In Euripidean lyric, however, there is no attested instance of ἐς ῞Αιδα and only one of ἐν ῞Αιδα (*El.* 122). Instead we get ε(ἰ)ς ῞Αιδαν at *Andr.* 1217, *Su.* 1004, *HF* 427, *Ion* 1496; πρὸς Ἀίδαν at *Hec.* 1033; and ῞Αιδαν as accusative of place whither at *Su.* 1141. It seems fairly clear, then, that *Tro.* 594 should read κοιμίσαι μ' ἐς ῞Αιδαν. For *El.* 122 we obviously have much less evidence, there being only this one instance of the Doric for 'in Hades'. But since we have no other instance of the elliptical use of the genitive of Hades' name in Doric, it does not seem extravagant to interpret transmitted ἅδα as a dative and write (trisyllabically, after Hermann) ἐν Ἀίδᾳ.

703-4: See *AJP* 105 (1984), 240.

886: See *AJP* 105 (1984), 240.

131-8

ἔκλυον φωνάν, ἔκλυον δὲ βοὰν
τᾶς δυστάνου Κολχίδος· οὐδέπω
ἤπιος; ἀλλ', ὦ γεραιά, λέξον.
ἀμφιπύλου γὰρ ἔσω μελάθρου γόον
ἔκλυον, οὐδὲ συνήδομαι, ὦ γύναι,
ἄλγεσι δώματος,
ἐπεί μοι φιλία κέκραται.

135 ἀμφιπύλου Weil: ἐπ' ἀμφ- codd. et Σ^{hbov} γόον Elmsley: βοὰν BODEALP: βοὴν HCV 137 φιλία κέκραται Porson: φίλον κέκραται OE: φίλον κέκρανται H$^{?}$BCDAVLP (φίλως V^{s}) et ^{i}Σ^{hb}: φίλα κέκραται Tr

Both the meter and the text of this astrophon are extremely difficult, and I do not feel entire confidence in the solution I put forward here. Its merits are that it gives not improbable colometry and not improbable sense, while other solutions seem to me to labor under greater or lesser degrees of improbability.

Metrically, we start with at least three anapestic metra (down to δυστάνου). We might expect the change to a different kind of metrical movement to take place beginning with ἀλλ', ὦ γεραιά, λέξον, and if we make a new beginning there, transmitted wording gives us an iambelegus (ἀλλ', ὦ γεραιά, λέξον· ἐπ' ἀμφιπύλου) followed by lines that have been variously emended but in any case are mostly double-short. The last colon is probably (adopting Porson's conjecture) δώματος ἐπεί μοι φιλία κέκραται, ia ch ba, where the first iamb begins with a dactyl and serves, as happens not rarely, as a kind of bridge between the dactyls of the previous line and the final iambic movement.

The alternative to a new beginning at ἀλλ', ὦ γεραιά, λέξον is to continue the anapests down to λέξον, as in Diggle's text. But the rhythm of Κολχίδος ἀλλ', ὦ γεραιά, λέξον read as anapestic dimeter is unattractive. It is also anomalous: Diggle in *Studies*, p. 97, lists

all the places where anapestic monometers and acatalectic dimeters exhibit ***brevis in longo***. The monometers are *Hec.* 83 (lyric) and 147 (non-lyric: but Diggle puts Porson's γαίας in his text), *Hip.* 1372 (lyric: 'suspicious, but possibly right'), and *IT* 157-8 (lyric: but Diggle adopts Murray's conjecture to eliminate it). The dimeters are *Hip.* 1377, *El.* 113 (where, however, the hiatus ἔμβα ἔμβα is evidence of corruption: see above), *Hec.* 159 (lyric: but Diggle adopts Porson's γενεά), *IT* 231, and *Ion* 167, where Diggle's apparatus considers the transposition of 169 to precede 168 in order to eliminate the ***brevis in longo***. Most of the cases Diggle accepts without change have a final anapestic foot ending with ***brevis in longo***: *Hec.* 83, *Hip.* 1372, 1377, *IT* 231, and *Ion* 167. Of cases where the manuscripts give a spondee ending in ***brevis in longo*** (*Hec.* 159, *IT* 157, *El.* 113) Diggle changes the first two and leaves the last. I argue above that he should have altered this as well. The fact that there is a change of meter in Diggle's text after λέξον will surely be urged in palliation, but it still remains true that an anapestic dimeter ending long-short is an anomaly.

Scarcely less awkward is that Diggle is thereafter forced to adopt Weil's deletion of ἐπ'. The deletion is tempting since the preposition is ruinous to the sense, but it is hard to explain why it was added, and the transmitted iambelegus looks genuine and should be preserved if the sense can be mended.

Let us see what can be done. In the first period, after three anapestic metra Κολχίδος οὐδέ πω ἤπιος could be taken as an ibycean: cf. *Andr.* 827 and *HF* 1030, ibyceans following paroemiacs. Or we might think, as Willink does, of supplying two further syllables at the end, ⟨ἰώ⟩ or ⟨οἴμοι⟩, to fill out the anapestic dimeter.

The next lines, as noted, make better metrical sense if we are not forced to delete ἐπ' with Weil as Diggle does. But the preposition is ruinous to the sense since ἀμφιπύλου μελάθρου is clearly governed by ἔσω. Before proceeding to emend ἐπ', we must ask ourselves whose house is meant, Medea's or that of the Chorus members. At *Tro.* 154-8 the Chorus explain their arrival by saying (apparently) that they heard Hecuba's cries while they were indoors, and at [A.] *PV* 133-4 the Chorus say that the sound of iron being struck reached them in their cave. This would suggest that in spite of the epithet ἀμφιπύλου, the μέλαθρον in question is that of the the individual Chorus members. The Chorus want to know whether Medea is still dis-

traught, for they heard her cries some time ago when they were still at home. The word 'still' or 'yet' obtrudes itself on any attempts to translate along these lines, and this means a ready welcome should be extended to Badham's ἔτ' for ἐπ'. There are parallels for a single word or prepositional phrase modified by ἔτι: *IT* 1250-2 ἔτι νιν ἔτι βρέφος, ἔτι φίλας ἐπὶ ματέρος ἀγκάλαισι θρῴσκων ἔκανες κτλ. and *Ba.* 1229 ἔτ' ἀμφὶ δρυμοὺς οἰστροπλῆγας ἀθλίας. In both of these cases, as in our passage, the main verb is unaffected by the ἔτι.

We may keep the manuscript reading βοὰν and adopt Wilamowitz' μελάθροιο, as I did in the Loeb:

ἔκλυον φωνάν, ἔκλυον δὲ βοὰν
τᾶς δυστάνου
Κολχίδος· οὐδέπω ἤπιος;
ἀλλ' ὦ γεραιά, λέξον· ἔτ' ἀμφιπύλου
γὰρ ἔσω μελάθροιο βοὰν ἔκλυον,
οὐδὲ συνήδομαι, ὦ γύναι, ἄλγεσι
δώματος, ἐπεί μοι φιλία κέκραται.

Here the period-end at 135 coincides with both a light pause and with the change from rising to falling double-short rhythm. Alternatively we could print γὰρ ἔσω μελάθρου βοὰν as a type of telesillean and the rest as 5da / ia ch ba or (with Diggle) as 4da / 2da / hi.

1181-4

ἤδη δ' ἀνελθὼν κῶλον ἐκπλέθρου δρόμου
ταχὺς βαδιστὴς τερμόνων ἂν ἥπτετο,
ἡ δ' ἐξ ἀναύδου καὶ μύσαντος ὄμματος
δεινὸν στενάξασ' ἡ τάλαιν' ἠγείρετο.

1181 ἀνελθὼν Lenting: ἀνέλκων codd. et Σ^{bv}: ἂν ἕλκων Schaefer ἔκπλεθρον L: P et $^{i}\Sigma^{beav}$:]ν Π^{9}: ἐκπλέθρου Reiske 1182 ἂν ἥπτετο Musgrave: ἀνθήπτετο codd. et Σ^{bv} 1183 οτ εξ Π^{9}

Page, following J. U. Powell, makes an entirely convincing case for reading Reiske's ἐκπλέθρου. The δρόμος at Olympia is roughly three plethra (ca. 100 yards) up and three back, so that 'one limb of a

six-plethra race-course' means the space of about a hundred yards. But we must decide what to read for the impossible ἀνέλκων of the manuscripts. Lenting's ἀνελθὼν seems easy: 'having traversed one limb of a six-plethra race-course', though to find a parallel for the verb Page is obliged to leave the fifth century for Callimachus, *Aetia*, fr. 7.4. It may not be amiss, however, to mention another attractive possibility. κῶλον is used nineteen further times in Euripides, and all of these refer to the human leg. Often it is used in an expression describing swift motion, as at *Hel.* 1301 δρομάδι κώλῳ Μάτηρ ἐσύθη θεῶν, *Ba.* 169 κῶλον ἄγειν ταχύπουν σκιρήμασι βάκχα, and *Ba.* 665 λευκὸν κῶλον ἐξηκόντισαν. We can have this meaning here if we take the genitive ἐκπλέθρου δρόμου with τερμόνων and find a verb to mean 'set in swift motion' to govern κῶλον, 'his feet'. (The aptness of the singular is proved from the three examples above.) That verb could well be Herwerden's ἑλίσσων, used with πόδα *vel sim.* at *Tro.* 333 and *IA* 212-5. The corruption is not difficult to explain: one of the commonest uncial errors is to read IC as K, and ΕΛΙCCΩΝ could easily have been reduced by this means to ΕΛΚΩΝ. Thereafter someone tried to repair the damage by writing ἀνέλκων. I thank Charles Willink for drawing my attention to Herwerden's conjecture.

In 1183 Diggle is apparently unimpressed by the papyrus variant. He seems to regard it as a case of trivialization, the replacement of a slightly more difficult parataxis with a more straightforward hypotaxis. At first sight, this analysis seems attractive. But further reflection reveals that the reading of the medieval tradition could have been impugned even without help from the papyrus, and now that we have that help it is foolish to refuse it. For the codices offer something that occurs nowhere else in Euripides, namely pronominal ὁ δέ *vel sim.* resumed by a substantive expression with the article. The closest parallels I can find are *Hcld.* 41, ἡ δ' αὖ τὸ θῆλυ παιδὸς Ἀλκμήνη γένος κτλ. and *Hip.* 47-8, ἡ δ' εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἀλλ' ὅμως ἀπόλλυται / Φαίδρα. But both are proper names and, more important, neither has the article. A computer search of all of the extant plays of Euripides for a parallel to ἡ δ' . . . ἡ τάλαινα reveals no other case where pronominal ὁ δέ, ἡ δέ, τὸ δέ or the corresponding plurals is followed by a nominal expression with the article expli-

cating it. I conclude that the reading of the papyrus has a better chance of being right than that of the medieval manuscripts.

INDICES

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Achilles' ghost and the weather: 63-5
Adrastus not an old man: 70-1, 72-3
anadiplosis of interrogative: 32-3
ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction: 135
asyndeton: 36, 42, 60, 83, 89, 122, 123, 150
comparatio paratactica: 71-2, 84
direct speech: 2
gloss extrudes original: 14, 30, 35, 38-9, 45, 79-80, 95-6, 99-100, 105, 140
gnomic aorist: 44
haplography: 12, 38
heralds: 149-50
hero cult: 18, 21-2, 65
homoearkton: 101
hyperbaton: 33-4, 87
interference of neighboring line: 4, 7, 11, 107
interpolation: 5-7, 47, 48-9, 56, 59, 60, 61, 61-2, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74-6, 81-2, 85-6, 98-9, 110-6, 120-3, 129, 130-1, 149-50
lacunae: 3, 4, 8, 13, 16, 19-20, 23-5, 25-7, 45-7, 57, 71-2, 76-7, 77-8, 83, 84, 88-9, 94, 101, 112-3, 117, 122, 124-5, 132-3, 136, 137-8, 139, 140-1, 141-3, 145-8
madness on the tragic stage: 141-3
meter
  lyric: 9, 28, 109-10, 152-4
  spoken: 97-8, 102
periphrastic verbal expressions: 69
purpose clauses in counter-factual situations: 36
questions
  double: 13
  surmise: 1
rhetoric: 67
scribal 'correction': 12-3, 14, 38, 83, 100, 155
sermo interruptus: 92-3
speaker attribution: 50, 76-7, 30-1, 50-1,
staging: 77, 137-8
subjunctive, voluntative: 9
transposition
  of lines: 10, 41-3, 89-91, 93-4
  of words: 35, 100, 118
word-order: 1, 87

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

῞Αιδου / ῞Αιδα: 150-1
αἶσα: 29
ἀνάγκη: 58
δ' ἀλλά: 79
ἐάω, 'omit': 22
εὖ λέγω: 77
ἦ / ἤ: 1
Ἰδαῖος, 'Trojan': 98
κάθαμμα λύειν: 31
κηδεύω: 69
κῶλον: 154-5
λεπαῖος: 97
λόγοι as an expedient: 32
μάλιστα with superlative: 28
οἷ, 'sibi': 114
οὐδέ: 84
οὔκουν . . . γε: 45
παρωθέω: 121
πληρόομαι: 52
ποιμήν (metaphorical): 72
πότερον . . . ἤ: 42-3
πρόβλημα: 118
φρέω: 121
φρονέω, 'be of sound mind': 45
χρή / (ἐ)χρῆν: 117
ὦ τᾶν: 7,
ὡς exclamatory: 142
ὡς δή: 44-5

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

Aeschylus
Ag. 853: 87
Cho. 97: 21
Eu. 244-75: 77
Sept. 623: 15
Su. 247: 132
Archilochus, fr. 128.5: 11
Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 726: 129; *Eccl.* 89: 52
Euripides
Alc. 141: 8; 207-8: 61; 212: 33; 213: 13; 537: 44; 706: 34; 871-8 (~889-94): 92; 1014: 44
Andr. 130-2: 58; 254: 46; 444: 45; 594: 44; 663-7: 122; 668-77: 82, 115; 1024: 110; 1062: 1; 1076-7: 61; 1154: 122; 1203: 29
Ba. 18-9: 52; 169: 155; 224: 44; 448: 53; 663: 51; 665: 155; 802: 7; 922: 129; 1068: 62; 1131-2: 81; 1229: 154; 1264ff.: 142
Cy. 117: 1; 129: 1; 207: 1; 528: 119; 606-7: 91-2
El. 130: 33; 155: 62; 222: 28; 237: 24; 290: 129; 317: 98; 330-1: 111; 425: 140; 559: 32; 638: 119; 771: 37; 852-3: 105; 907-8: 32; 947: 44; 967: 1; 779: 13; 1198-9: 33; 1303: 32; 1307: 29
Erechtheus, fr. 65.87-9 Austin: 21
Hcld. 95: 1; 97-8: 5; 255: 6; 292-3: 149; 426: 149; 565: 79; 599: 8; 602-4: 62; 672: 61; 688: 7; 711: 14; 792: 12
Hec. 112: 64; 228: 41; 238: 51; 250: 32; 260-1: 64; 260-4: 43; 325: 98; 337: 28; 354: 98; 391: 79; 397: 4; 432: 20; 488-91: 92; 592: 27; 606: 41; 620: 28; 888: 62; 1013: 1; 1044: 122; 1152: 44; 1277: 119
Hel. 1: 95; 88: 102; 296-7: 119; 316: 33; 536: 22; 658: 98; 1038: 44; 1057: 44; 1251: 45; 1301: 155; 1495ff.: 64; 1509-10: 33; 1543: 13; 1627: 68; 1635: 131
HF 80: 33; 143: 140; 145: 1; 220: 102; 451: 33; 464: 96; 620: 1; 640: 52; 678: 41; 1283: 33; 1329-33: 8; 1407: 44
Hip. 294: 102; 485: 28; 567: 9; 571: 33; 688: 32; 782: 1; 785: 34; 960: 32; 973-5: 39; 1009-20: 59; 1025-6: 33; 1092-5: 39; 1123: 38; 1193: 8; 1265: 20; 1421: 28
IA 212-5: 155; 1036-9: 34
Ion 167: 100; 654: 44; 793: 13; 978: 79; 1111: 52; 1294: 32
IT 82: 97; 147: 100; 306: 52; 516: 45; 591-2: 128; 603: 62; 673: 51; 682: 44; 718: 8; 895: 33; 1025: 44; 1184: 45; 1250-2: 154; 1457: 97; 1487ff.: 64
Med. 94: 69; 224: 119; 355: 140; 359-60: 33; 533: 129; 942: 79; 965: 32; 1181-2: 109; 1226: 32; 1280: 37
Or. 66: 60; 154: 33; 211: 141; 276: 142; 333: 33; 459: 102; 476: 51; 665: 2; 607: 45; 831-2: 33; 960: 79; 1147: 129; 1380: 98; 1473: 102; 1655: 97
Phaethon 241: 69
Pho. 458: 108; 873: 44; 956: 119; 1066: 29; 1140: 72; 1335: 32; 1363: 61; 1498-9: 33; 1553: 13; 1667: 79
Rhes. 167: 79; 915: 8
Su. 106: 1; 155-9: 75; 160: 73; 211-3: 74; 216-8: 75; 223-5: 74-5; 250-1: 70; 304: 86; 396-7: 123; 423: 86; 458-62: 149; 477: 44; 518: 4; 526-7: 86; 561-3: 86; 574-5: 86; 605-6: 33-4; 623: 33; 671-2: 86; 674: 72; 744: 85; 1048: 33; 1189-90: 75; 1222: 119
Tro. 161: 1; 175: 8; 199: 98; 333: 155; 342: 68; 684: 108; 726: 62; 772-3: 62; 889: 51; 1036: 108; 1126: 97
fr. 852.2: 8
Gorgias, *Palamedes*: 42
Herodotus 3.134: 22; 7.30: 87

Hesiod, *Op.* 340: 22
Hesychius κ 84: 31
Hippocrates, περὶ φυσῶν 14: 142
Homer
Iliad 2.546-9: 39; 11.615: 87; 12.274: 87; 21.221: 22; 24.21: 22
Od. 1.344: 79; 7.80-1: 39; 11.61: 29; 15.444: 22
Hymn to Demeter 300: 29
Sophocles
Aj. 670-5: 131
Ant. 259-60: 81
El. 52: 103
OC 593: 22
OT 536-7: 2; 1145: 7; 1347: 6
fr. 777: 97
Suda κ 31: 31
Thuc. 2.36: 22; 2.45.2: 78
Zenobius, *Prov.* 4.46: 31

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY J. M. BREMER, L. F. JANSSEN, H. PINKSTER
H. W. PLEKET, C. J. RUIJGH AND P. H. SCHRIJVERS

4. LEEMAN, A.D. *A Systematical Bibliography of Sallust (1879-1964).* Revised and augmented edition. 1965. ISBN 90 04 01467 5
5. LENZ, F.W. (ed.). *The Aristeides 'Prolegomena'.* 1959. ISBN 90 04 01468 3
7. McKAY, K.J. *Erysichthon. A Callimachean Comedy.* 1962. ISBN 90 04 01470 5
11. RUTILIUS LUPUS. *De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis.* Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by E. Brooks. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01474 8
12. SMYTH, W.R. (ed.). *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum.* 1970. ISBN 90 04 01475 6
13. LEVIN, D.N. *Apollonius' 'Argonautica' re-examined.* 1. The Neglected First and Second Books. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02575 8
14. REINMUTH, O.W. *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1971. ISBN 90 04 01476 4
16. ROSE, K.F.C. *The Date and Author of the 'Satyricon'.* With an Introduction by J.P. Sullivan. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02578 2
18. WILLIS, J. *De Martiano Capella emendando.* 1971. ISBN 90 04 02580 4
19. HERINGTON, C.J. (ed.). *The Older Scholia on the Prometheus Bound.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03455 2
20. THIEL, H. VAN. *Petron. Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion.* 1971. ISBN 90 04 02581 2
21. LOSADA, L.A. *The Fifth Column in the Peloponnesian War.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03421 8
23. BROWN, V. *The Textual Transmission of Caesar's 'Civil War'.* 1972. ISBN 90 04 03457 9
24. LOOMIS, J.W. *Studies in Catullan Verse.* An Analysis of Word Types and Patterns in the Polymetra. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03429 3
27. GEORGE, E.V. *Aeneid VIII and the Aitia of Callimachus.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 03859 0
29. BERS, V. *Enallage and Greek Style.* 1974. ISBN 90 04 03786 1
37. SMITH, O.L. *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus. 1. The Recensions of Demetrius Triclinius.* 1975. ISBN 90 04 04220 2
39. SCHMELING, G.L. & J.H. STUCKEY. *A Bibliography of Petronius.* 1977 ISBN 90 04 04753 0
44. THOMPSON, W.E. *De Hagniae Hereditate. An Athenian Inheritance Case.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04757 3
45. McGUSHIN, P. *Sallustius Crispus, 'Bellum Catilinae'. A Commentary.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 04835 9
46. THORNTON, A. *The Living Universe. Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid.* 1976. ISBN 90 04 04579 1
48. BRENK, F.E. *In Mist apparelled. Religious Themes in Plutarch's 'Moralia' and 'Lives'.* 1977. ISBN 90 04 05241 0
51. SUSSMAN, L.A. *The Elder Seneca.* 1978. ISBN 90 04 05759 5
57. BOER, W. DEN. *Private Morality in Greece and Rome.* Some Historical Aspects. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05976 8
61. *Hieronymus' Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57).* Ein Kommentar von G.J.M. Bartelink. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06085 5
63. HOHENDAHL-ZOETELIEF, I.M. *Manners in the Homeric Epic.* 1980. ISBN 90 04 06223 8
64. HARVEY, R.A. *A Commentary on Persius.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06313 7
65. MAXWELL-STUART, P.G. *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology.* 1. γλαυκός. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06406 0
68. ACHARD, G. *Pratique rhétorique et idéologie politique dans les discours 'Optimates' de Cicéron.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06374 9
69. MANNING, C.E. *On Seneca's 'Ad Marciam'.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06430 3

70. BERTHIAUME, G. *Les rôles du Mágeiros.* Etude sur la boucherie, la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne. 1982. ISBN 90 04 06554 7
71. CAMPBELL, M. *A commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomerica XII.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06502 4
72. CAMPBELL, M. *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius.* 1981. ISBN 90 04 06503 2
73. MOSKALEW, W. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid.* 1982. ISBN 90 04 06580 6
74. RACE, W.H. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius.* 1982. ISBN 90 04 06515 6
75. MOORHOUSE, A.C. *The Syntax of Sophocles.* 1982. ISBN 90 04 06599 7
77. WITKE, C. *Horace's Roman Odes.* A Critical Examination. 1983. ISBN 90 04 07006 0
78. ORANJE, J. *Euripides' 'Bacchae'.* The Play and its Audience. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07011 7
79. STATIUS. *Thebaidos Libri XII.* Recensuit et cum apparatu critico et exegetico instruxit D.E. Hill. 1983. ISBN 90 04 06917 8
82. DAM, H.-J. VAN. *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae Book II.* A Commentary. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07110 5
84. OBER, J. *Fortress Attica. Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier, 404-322 B.C.* 1985. ISBN 90 04 07243 8
85. HUBBARD, T.K. *The Pindaric Mind.* A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07303 5
86. VERDENIUS, W.J. *A Commentary on Hesiod: Works and Days*, vv. 1-382. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07465 1
87. HARDER, A. *Euripides' 'Kresphontes' and 'Archelaos'.* Introduction, Text and Commentary. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07511 9
88. WILLIAMS, H.J. *The 'Eclogues' and 'Cynegetica' of Nemesianus.* Edited with an Introduction and Commentary. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07486 4
89. McGING, B.C. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus.* 1986. ISBN 90 04 07591 7
91. SIDEBOTHAM, S.E. *Roman Economic Policy in the Erythra Thalassa 30 B.C.-A.D. 217.* 1986. ISBN 90 04 07644 1
92. VOGEL, C.J. DE. *Rethinking Plato and Platonism.* 2nd impr. of the first (1986) ed. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08755 9
93. MILLER, A.M. *From Delos to Delphi.* A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07674 3
94. BOYLE, A.J. *The Chaonian Dove.* Studies in the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid of Virgil. 1986. ISBN 90 04 07672 7
95. KYLE, D.G. *Athletics in Ancient Athens.* 2nd impr. of the first (1987) ed. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09759 7
97. VERDENIUS, W.J. *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. I. Olympian Odes 3, 7, 12, 14.* 1987. ISBN 90 04 08126 7
98. PROIETTI, G. *Xenophon's Sparta.* An introduction. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08338 3
99. BREMER, J.M., A.M. VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP & S.R. SLINGS. *Some Recently Found Greek Poems.* Text and Commentary. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08319 7
100. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN. *Hephaistion on Metre.* Translation and Commentary. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08452 5
101. VERDENIUS, W.J. *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. II.* Olympian Odes 1, 10, 11, Nemean 11, Isthmian 2. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08535 1
102. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *Time holds the Mirror. A Study of Knowledge in Euripides' 'Hippolytus'.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08601 3
103. MARCOVICH, M. *Alcestis Barcinonensis.* Text and Commentary. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08600 5
104. HOLT, F.L. *Alexander the Great and Bactria.* The Formation of a Greek Frontier in Central Asia. Repr. 1993. ISBN 90 04 08612 9

105. BILLERBECK, M. *Seneca's Tragödien; sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen.* Mit Anhängen zur Sprache des Hercules Oetaeus und der Octavia. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08631 5
106. ARENDS, J.F.M. *Die Einheit der Polis. Eine Studie über Platons Staat.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08785 0
107. BOTER, G.J. *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08787 7
108. WHEELER, E.L. *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08831 8
109. BUCKLER, J. *Philip II and the Sacred War.* 1989. ISBN 90 04 09095 9
110. FULLERTON, M.D. *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09146 7
111. ROTHWELL, K.S. *Politics and Persuasion in Aristophanes' 'Ecclesiazusae'.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09185 8
112. CALDER, W.M. & A. DEMANDT. *Eduard Meyer.* Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09131 9
113. CHAMBERS, M.H. *Georg Busolt. His Career in His Letters.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09225 0
114. CASWELL, C.P. *A Study of 'Thumos' in Early Greek Epic.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09260 9
115. EINGARTNER, J. *Isis und ihre Dienerinnen in der Kunst der Römischen Kaiserzeit.* 1991. ISBN 90 04 09312 5
116. JONG, I. DE. *Narrative in Drama.* The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09406 7
117. BOYCE, B.T. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius'* Cena Trimalchionis. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09431 8
118. RÜTTEN, Th. *Demokrit — lachender Philosoph und sanguinischer Melancholiker.* 1992. ISBN 90 04 09523 3
119. KARAVITES, P. (with the collaboration of Th. Wren). *Promise-Giving and Treaty-Making.* Homer and the Near East. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09567 5
120. SANTORO L'HOIR, F. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms.* 'Man', 'Woman' and the portrayal of character in Latin prose. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09512 8
121. WALLINGA, H.T. *Ships and Sea-Power before the Great Persian War.* The Ancestry of the Ancient Trireme. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09650 7
122. FARRON, S. *Vergil's Æneid: A Poem of Grief and Love.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09661 2
123. LÉTOUBLON, F. *Les lieux communs du roman.* Stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09724 4
124. KUNTZ, M. *Narrative Setting and Dramatic Poetry.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09784 8
125. THEOPHRASTUS. *Metaphysics.* With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Marlein van Raalte. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09786 4
126. THIERMANN, P. *Die* Orationes Homeri *des Leonardo Bruni Aretino.* Kritische Edition der lateinischen und kastilianischen Übersetzung mit Prolegomena und Kommentar. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09719 8
127. LEVENE, D.S. *Religion in Livy.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09617 5
128. PORTER, J.R. *Studies in Euripides'* Orestes. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09662 0
129. SICKING, C.M.J. & J.M. VAN OPHUIJSEN. *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage.* Lysias and Plato. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09867 4
130. JONG, I.J.F. DE, & J.P. SULLIVAN (eds.). *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09571 3
131. YAMAGATA, N. *Homeric Morality.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09872 0
132. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09926 3
133. SUSSMAN, L.A. *The Declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus.* Text, Translation, and Commentary. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09983 2
134. SMOLENAARS, J.J.L. *Statius*: Thebaid VII. A Commentary. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10029 6
135. SMALL, D.B. (ed.). *Methods in the Mediterranean.* Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09581 0
136. DOMINIK, W.J. *The Mythic Voice of Statius.* Power and Politics in the *Thebaid.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09972 7

137. SLINGS, S.R. *Plato's Apology of Socrates.* A Literary and Philosophical Study with a Running Commentary. Edited and Completed from the Papers of the Late E. DE STRYCKER, s.j. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10103 9
138. FRANK, M. *Seneca's* Phoenissae. Introduction and Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09776 7
139. MALKIN, I. & Z.W. RUBINSOHN (eds.). *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World.* Studies in Honor of ZVI YAVETZ. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09917 4
140. SEGAL, A. *Theatres in Roman Palestine and Provincia Arabia.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10145 4
141. CAMPBELL, M. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius* Argonautica III 1-471. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10158 6
142. DEFOREST, M.M. *Apollonius'* Argonautica: *A Callimachean Epic.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 10017 2
143. WATSON, P.A. *Ancient Stepmothers.* Myth, Misogyny and Reality. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10176 4
144. SULLIVAN, S.D. *Psychological and Ethical Ideas.* What Early Greeks Say. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10185 3
145. CARGILL, J. *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 09991 3
146. PANAYOTAKIS, C. *Theatrum Arbitri.* Theatrical Elements in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10229 9
147. GARRISON, E.P. *Groaning Tears.* Ethical and Dramatic Aspects of Suicide in Greek Tragedy. 1995. 90 04 10241 8
148. OLSON, S.D. *Blood and Iron.* Stories and Storytelling in Homer's *Odyssey.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10251 5
149. VINOGRADOV, J.G.& S.D. KRYŽICKIJ (eds.). *Olbia.* Eine altgriechische Stadt im Nordwestlichen Schwarzmeerraum. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09677 9
150. MAURER, K. *Interpolation in Thucydides.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10300 7
151. HORSFALL, N. (ed.) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil.* 1995 ISBN 90 04 09559 4
152. KNIGHT, V.H. *The Renewal of Epic.* Responses to Homer in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10386 4
153. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *The Gorgon's Severed Head.* Studies of *Alcestis, Electra,* and *Phoenissae.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10382 1
154. NAVARRO ANTOLÍN, F. (ed.). *Lygdamus.* Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber. Translated by J.J. Zoltowski. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10210 8
155. MATTHEWS, V.J. *Antimachus of Colophon.* Text and Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10468 2
156. TREISTER, M.Y. *The Role of Metals in Ancient Greek History.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10473 9
157. WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.). *Voice into Text.* Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10431 3
158. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book V.* A Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10506 9
159. SCHMELING, G. (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 09630 2
160. SICKING, C.M.J. & P. STORK. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10460 7
161. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Altera.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10624 3